

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 745

CE 038 534

TITLE Convention '83. Program of the Annual National Vocational Special Needs Research Meeting (1st, Anaheim, California, December 2, 1983).

INSTITUTION American Vocational Association, Arlington, VA. Div. of Special Needs.; National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel.

PUB DATE 2 Dec 83

NOTE 137p.; Parts of this document may not reproduce well due to light type.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Disabilities; *Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Educational Practices; *Educational Research; Educational Strategies; Employment Potential; High School Students; Individual Needs; Job Skills; Research Reports; School Holding Power; Secondary Education; *Special Education; *Student Needs; Student Participation; Student Recruitment; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification; Vocational Education; Work Attitudes; Work Experience

IDENTIFIERS Related Subjects Instruction; *Special Needs Students

ABSTRACT

This document consists of six papers presented at a convention on vocational special needs research. Included in the volume are the following papers: "Extent of Involvement of Special Needs Students in DECA: A National Perspective," by Michelle Sarkees and Joe Hill; "Recruitment Procedures and Strategies for Increasing Retention of Disadvantaged Students in Occupational Proficient Programs," by Dolores Robinson and Dwight Fennell; "The Effects of Work Experience on Basic Employment Skills and Work Attitudes of Disadvantaged High School Youth," by Ruth Gibson; "Related Vocational Instruction: A Difference in Attitudes of Vocational Teachers Toward Special Needs Students," by Lu B. Nations; "Access and Process Considerations for Mildly Handicapped Students in Vocational Education: Findings from Two Studies," by William Halloran, Len Albright, James Frasier, and Brian Cobb; and "Vocational/Special Education Certification: An Analysis of Current State Policies and Practices," by James Greenan and David Larkin. (MN)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *



Convention '83

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B Nations & Albright

J Hill M Surtees
R Gosm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Program
of the
first annual
national
vocational
special
needs
research
meeting



AWA

Anaheim,
California
December 2,
1983

CE 038534

VOCATIONAL SPECIAL NEEDS
RESEARCH MEETING

December 2, 1983

Anaheim, California

Sponsored by
The Division of Special Needs, American Vocational Association
and
The National Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel.

Volume I

FIRST ANNUAL VOCATIONAL SPECIAL NEEDS RESEARCH MEETING

Co-chairpersons:

Susan B. Asselin
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Jerry Wircenski
Pennsylvania State University

Reviewers:

Special Needs Research Committee

Dave Kinsbury
Benidji State University
Dorothea Hiltenbrand
George Washington University
Dick Omer
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Ruth Gibson
Georgia State University
Joyce Bales
Greenville, Tennessee Vocational School
Connie Bohns
White Bear Lake, Minnesota School District
James Greenan
University of Illinois
Cynthia N. Schloss
Pennsylvania State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic I

"Extent of Involvement of Special Needs Students in DECA: A National Perspective"

Michelle Sarkees, Joe Hill, University of Georgia

Topic II

"Recruitment Procedures and Strategies for Increasing Retention of Disadvantaged Students in Occupational Proficient Programs"

Dolores Robinson, Dwight Fennell, Florida State University

Topic III

"The Effects of Work Experience on Basic Employment Skills and Work Attitudes of Disadvantaged High School Youth"

Ruth Gibson, Georgia State University

Topic IV

"Related Vocational Instruction: A Difference in Attitudes of Vocational Teachers Toward Special Needs Students"

Lu B. Nations, Griffin High School, Georgia

Topic V

"Access and Process Considerations for Mildly Handicapped Students in Vocational Education: Findings from Two Studies"

William Halloran, Linda Parrish - Reactors

Len Albright, University of Vermont

James Frasier, Hartford Area Vocational Center, Vermont

Brian Cobb, University of Maryland

Topic VI

"Vocational/Special Education Certification: An Analysis of Current State Policies and Practices"

James Greenan, David Larkin, University of Illinois

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT OF
SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS IN DECA:
A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Michelle D. Sarkess
Associate Professor
Division of Vocational Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dr. Joe E. Hill
Associate Professor
Department of Marketing and
Distributive Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

American Vocational Association
Special Needs Division Research Seminar
Anaheim, California
December 2, 1983

INTRODUCTION

Very few vocational educators are unaware of the emphasis placed on special needs students in vocational education programs during the past decade. Special needs students, as defined by vocational legislation, include handicapped individuals (mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled and health impaired individuals) and disadvantaged individuals (academically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged and limited English proficiency populations).

Legislative mandates during the past ten years have been passed to provide equal access to vocational education programs for special needs learners. These laws include (a) The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) which emphasizes that identified handicapped students should be placed in regular education programs that are least restrictive to their handicapping conditions, (b) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112) requires that no otherwise qualified handicapped person shall be excluded from participation in programs or activities which receive federal funds, including vocational education programs, and (c) The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) which mandate specific setaside funds from basic grant monies provided for each state. The setasides are established at 10% of the basic grant to be used to provide program improvement and supportive services for handicapped students in vocational programs and 20% to be expended for disadvantaged students. These monies must be matched on a 50/50 basis with state and local funds and can only be used

to offset the excess costs which are above and beyond what other students are provided in a regular vocational program.

As a result of these laws, a significant increase has been seen in efforts to provide access to and equality of vocational education opportunities for special needs populations.

The numbers of special needs students enrolled in vocational programs has significantly increased during the past several years. The enrollment of handicapped individuals in these program areas has increased 89.9% from 1972-73. The 1979-80 enrollment figures recorded by the National Center for Education Statistics reveal that 400,575 handicapped students were enrolled in vocational education programs. A total of 12,204 handicapped students were enrolled in distribution programs during this academic year.

During the same seven year period the enrollment of disadvantaged students increased by 64.5%. A total of 91,453 disadvantaged students and 2,974 limited English Proficient (LEP) students were enrolled in distribution programs. These three categories of special needs students represented 11.1% of the total enrollment in distribution programs.

The increased enrollment is encouraging. However, there is little evidence to indicate that these students are becoming actively involved in vocational student organization activities. These organizations are an integral part of our curriculum and contribute to the comprehensive learning experience of the students. The activities, rather than being extracurricular, are intracurricular because they are integrated into the ongoing instructional program. Experiences gained from participation in VSO's also reinforce and

supplement the material covered in classroom instruction by providing new perspectives and a positive, stimulating learning atmosphere.

There are many advantages of participating in vocational student organizations, including: (a) providing an opportunity to build self-confidence, (b) providing motivation to learn, (c) providing valuable information about independent living and citizenship, (d) developing leadership skills, (e) developing interpersonal relationship skills, (f) improving vocationally related and employability skills, and (g) providing for effective teacher-student interaction.

Traditionally, special needs students enrolled in vocational programs have been discouraged from participating in VSO activities. Several key factors relating to this issue were identified by Birchenall and Wanat (1981) as follows:

1. Lack of motivation and self-confidence.
2. A tendency toward selective and elitist membership in VSO's.
3. Negative attitudes of administrators and supervisors concerning the integration and participation of handicapped students in VSO's.
4. Emphasis on competition.
5. Insufficient or inappropriate activities for the handicapped.
6. Lack of recruitment and public relations activities to encourage the handicapped to join VSO's.
7. Insufficient support services to accommodate the special needs of handicapped students (e.g., transportation for after-school activities).
8. Attempt to create separate student organizations for the handicapped.

4

One challenge facing vocational education in this next decade is that of meeting the needs of special needs students enrolled in vocational programs. If we as vocational teachers truly believe that VSO's are an integral part of our curriculum, then every classified student, special needs or others, should be involved, or have the opportunity to be involved. The process of making this a reality is quite simple: we need to actively recruit special needs students and prepare the competitive events in which special needs students can compete. Properly managed, the VSO is one of our most valuable methods of delivering vocational instruction.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study was to determine the extent of involvement of special needs students in Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA) chapters and competitive events, including the degree of participation in chapter activities and competency skill events, the level of support services provided by the local district and special techniques and modifications used to assist these students in DECA competency/skill events and chapter activities.

To achieve this purpose, the study was centered around the following research questions:

1. To what extent does the level of education achieved by the DECA chapter advisor affect the level of involvement of special needs students in DECA activities and competitive events?
2. To what extent does undergraduate training in working with special needs students affect the level of involvement of

special needs students in DECA activities and competitive events?

3. To what extent does graduate training in working with special needs students affect the level of involvement of special needs students in DECA activities and competitive events?
4. To what extent does the number of years of teaching experience of DECA advisors affect the level of involvement of special needs students in DECA activities and competitive events?
5. To what extent does the number of years as a DECA chapter advisor affect the level of involvement of special needs students in DECA activities and competitive events?

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A survey form was developed. The questions on the survey were discussed by personnel in vocational special needs, marketing and distributive education and DECA advisors. This preliminary questionnaire was field tested by graduate students enrolled in several courses at the University of Georgia (Marketing and Distributive Education course, Vocational Special Needs course) as well as a number of DECA advisors in Georgia. Changes were made in the survey instrument as a result of the field testing.

The state DECA advisor was contacted in each state and the District of Columbia. These advisors were asked to supply the names and addresses of five DECA advisors who are currently working with handicapped and disadvantaged in their DECA chapters. A coded survey

questionnaire was sent to each of these five advisors with a letter of explanation presenting the objectives of the study and how the researchers obtained their names. A background data sheet was also included in the packet. This form was designed to collect important data concerning relevant variables (i.e., highest level of education completed, training in working with special populations, number of years taught and number of years as a chapter advisor).

A system for collecting responses was developed. After a period of one month, a second questionnaire was sent to non respondents with a follow-up cover letter.

Following the second mailout a total of 132 responses were received. This represented a 59% return. At this time these responses were examined to determine whether a representative sample was received in relationship to geographic area, sex, level of education, training vehicle in working with special needs learners (e.g., coursework, preservice, inservice, workshops, volunteer work), number of years taught and number of years as chapter advisor. The results indicated that the returns were uniformly representative of the aforementioned areas; therefore, the data was processed.

A researcher from the Division of Educational Psychology at the University of Georgia consulted with the authors at various stages of the instrument development, methodology and analysis stages.

A one-way analysis of variance was the statistical procedure used, with the survey instrument representing the dependent variable. The independent variables were: (a) highest level of education completed, (b) training in working with special needs students at the undergraduate level, (c) training in working with special needs stu-

dents at the graduate level, (d) number of years of teaching experience and (e) number of years as a chapter advisor. The purpose of the ANOVA is to compare groups in terms of the mean score.

Summary ANOVA tables for the five independent variables are presented below.

TABLE 1
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE
FOR HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

Source	DF	SS	MS	F
Educational Level	4	121.18	30.29	0.13* PR > F
Within Group	128	30169.96	235.70	0.9718
Total	132	30291.14		

*P < .05

TABLE 2
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE
FOR TRAINING IN WORKING WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
STUDENTS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

Source	DF	SS	MS	F
Undergraduate Programs	9	3393.36	377.04	1.72* PR > F
Within Groups	123	26897.78	218.68	.0899
Total	132	30291.14		

*F < .05

TABLE 3
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE
FOR TRAINING IN WORKING WITH SPECIAL NEEDS
STUDENTS AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

Source	DF	SS	MS	F
Graduate Programs	10	5279.13	527.91	2.55* PR > F
Within Programs	121	25001.14	206.62	.0078
Total	131	30280.27		

*P < .05

TABLE 4
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE
FOR YEARS TAUGHT

Source	DF	SS	MS	F
Years Taught	4	470.47	117.62	0.50# PR > F
Within Groups	127	29809.79	234.72	.7350
Total	131	30280.26		

*P < .05

TABLE 5
ANOVA SUMMARY TABLE
FOR YEARS AS A CHAPTER ADVISOR

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	
Years as Advisor	4	1169.15	292.29	1.36*	PR > F
Within Groups	126	27007.66	214.35		.2503
Total	130	28176.81			

*P < .05

RESULTS: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The purpose of the study was to determine the extent of involvement of special needs students in DECA chapter activities and competitive events.

Looking at the summary tables it is evident that only one independent variable was found to be significant at the .05 level: training in working with special needs students at the graduate level.

In an attempt to determine the number of responses to various training options/patterns a cross coding was developed as follows:

TABLE 6
TRAINING OPTIONS/PATTERNS

0. NONE
1. COURSEWORK
2. COURSEWORK + PRESERVICE
3. COURSEWORK + WORKSHOP

4. COURSEWORK + VOLUNTEER
5. COURSEWORK + PRESERVICE + WORKSHOP
6. COURSEWORK + PRESERVICE + VOLUNTEER
7. COURSEWORK + PRESERVICE + WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER
8. PRESERVICE
9. PRESERVICE + WORKSHOP
10. PRESERVICE + VOLUNTEER
11. PRESERVICE
12. WORKSHOP
13. WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER
14. WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER + COURSEWORK
15. VOLUNTEER
16. WORKSHOP + INSERVICE
17. COURSEWORK + INSERVICE
18. COURSEWORK + INSERVICE + WORKSHOP
19. INSERVICE
20. COURSEWORK + INSERVICE + WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER

The percentage of responses to these training options/patterns were as follows:

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE TO TRAINING OPTIONS/PATTERNS

Training Option/Pattern	Percentage of Response
** NONE	34.3
** COURSEWORK	17.5
** COURSEWORK + WORKSHOP	6.5

Training Option/Pattern	Percentage of Response
** COURSEWORK + VOLUNTEER	.7
** WORKSHOP	7.2
** WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER + COURSEWORK	1.4
** WORKSHOP + INSERVICE	3.6
** COURSEWORK + INSERVICE	4.3
** COURSEWORK + INSERVICE + WORKSHOP	9.4
** INSERVICE	9.4
** COURSEWORK + INSERVICE + WORKSHOP + VOLUNTEER	1.4

Conclusions

Conclusions presented in the study indicate that, of the five independent variables, only training experiences in working with special needs learners at the graduate level had any significant effect on the extent of involvement of these learners in DECA activities and competitive events.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions in this study a number of recommendations are made concerning the involvement of special needs learners in DECA chapter activities and competitive events.

1. Increased emphasis should be made at the preservice level to acquaint MDE majors with effective techniques and modifications in working with special needs learners.
2. Increased emphasis should be placed on MDE majors with effective techniques and modifications in working with

special needs learners. (e.g., certification mandate to include methods and techniques of working with special needs learners).

3. Workshops and inservice sessions should be provided to MDE personnel to acquaint them with effective techniques and modifications in working with special needs learners.
4. Workshops and inservice sessions should be provided to support personnel (e.g., special education, resource teachers, disadvantaged specialists) to acquaint them with information on MDE programs and DECA chapter activities.
5. Cross training inservice sessions should be conducted involving both DECA advisors and support personnel.
6. Student participation in DECA activities should be incorporated into the individualized plans for the students (e.g., IEP).
7. Competitive events should be modified to incorporate different learning styles and individual capabilities (e.g., taped directions, hands-on demonstrations).
8. Facilities where chapter activities and/or competitive events take place should be examined for accessibility.

REFERENCES

- Birchenall, J., & Wanat, J. Serving the handicapped in vocational student organizations. Voc Ed, April 1981, 56 (3), 51-54.
- Closer Look. What do we mean by vocational education for handicapped youth? Washington DC: Parents' Campaign for Handicapped Children and Youth, 1980.
- Federal Register, 42 (191), October 3, 1977. Fracaroli, M. How to become a better advisor. Voc Ed, September 1981, 56 (6), 50-52.
- Harris, T., & Sweet, G. Why we believe in vocational student organizations. Voc Ed, September 1981, 56 (6), 33-35.
- Hill, J., & Sarkees, M. Special needs students in distributive education programs. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers, Summer 1981, (3) 250-258.
- Sarkees, M., & Hill, J. A special challenge for marketing and distributive education. The Balance Sheet, November/December 1983, (65) 37-39.
- Sarkees, M. Vocational student organizations: benefits for handicapped students. Teaching Exceptional Children, Fall 1983, 60-64.

RESOURCES

- American Vocational Association. Vocational education today. Fact sheet. Arlington VA: AVA Publications and Communications Department.
- Illinois Coordinating Council for Vocational Student Organizations. Illinois vocational student organizations local advisor's book. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, 1979.
- The Center for Vocational Education. Prepare student vocational organization members for leadership roles. (Module H-3, Professional Teacher Education Module Series). Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1977.
- The Center for Vocational Education. Guide participation in student vocational organization contests. (Module H-6), Professional Teacher Education Module Series). Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1977.

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY STRATEGIES TO INCREASE RETENTION
OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENT PROGRAMS
IN SELECTED AREAS OF HIGH YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT AND SCHOOL DROPCUTS

Dolores M. Robinson
Associate Professor

AND

Dwight J. Fennell
Graduate Assistant

Program of Vocational Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Introduction and Need for the Study

The Education Amendments of 1976 included specific provisions to provide extended and special services to disadvantaged persons in the area of vocational education (Riddle, 1981). With this legislation, the interest in vocational education not only increased for the regular vocational student but also for the disadvantaged vocational student. More specifically, the 1976 Amendments designated the amount to be set aside as twenty percent to help disadvantaged students successfully participate in regular vocational education programs (David and Hendrickson, 1982).

As a result of the continued federal emphasis in vocational education, researchers continue to review and reassess vocational education programs. Bottoms and Copa (1983) noted that the number of institutions offering comprehensive vocational education programs has more than doubled from 1,130 in 1965, to 3,200 in 1977. According to these researchers, not only has there been an increase in the number of vocational institutions, but also "program categories in vocational education have grown from just 100 in 1965 to more than 400 in 1983" p. 348.

Even though federal legislation and supportive resources were given to vocational development, there is an astonishingly meager number of disadvantaged students who matriculate in such programs. Research has shown that during 1979 alone, 17.3 million students were matriculated in vocational courses at the secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels. Of this number, 7.3 millions students were enrolled in occupationally specific programs (those programs that prepare workers for definite jobs and trades) but only 12% were disadvantaged students (Weisberg, 1983). However, even more astonishing was the meager number of disadvantaged students who completed programs subsequent to matriculation. Findings from a study for the State of Arkansas (1975) revealed that the average dropout rate for vocational students prior to program completion was 31%; and the average dropout rate of one institution was near 57%.

A New Hampshire study also gives significant dropout and withdrawal results. The study indicated that although disadvantaged students accounted for only 4.8% of the total vocational education enrollment they accounted for 29.6% of the dropouts (Department of Education, New Hampshire, 1981). The problem of low retention among disadvantaged students deters them from fulfilling the job demands in a variety of occupations. If these persons can be retained and trained for the various jobs being created, the addition of this relatively untapped labor pool will be a valuable resource.

Objectives of the Study

This study was designed to identify successful recruitment practices and strategies for increasing retention of disadvantaged students in occupational proficient programs. To achieve this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What specific obstacles have barred the disadvantaged from successful completion of occupational proficient programs?

2. What are the success factors related to effective vocational education programs for disadvantaged?
3. What strategies may be employed for successful recruitment of disadvantaged students?
4. What strategies may be used to successfully evaluate disadvantaged students?

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were adopted from research by Simcoe (1979) and adapted for this study.

Simcoe's research identified problems of oversubscription and poor self-image as the major obstacles to enrollment in and successful completion of disadvantaged students in vocational programs. It was further suggested that vocational education teachers often discourage disadvantaged students from enrolling in their courses, which also contribute to low enrollments.

The instruments used in this study employed a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from no basis for opinion; strongly agree; agree; disagree; and strongly disagree. The instrument was designed to collect teachers evaluation of: a) successful instructional techniques; b) successful recruitment strategies; and c) barriers to enrollment and success in educating disadvantaged students. An open-ended response was also provided for teachers to describe what they needed to improve teaching services to the disadvantaged.

Methods and Procedures

Vocational Education teachers from fifteen counties were selected to participate in this study. Ten of the fifteen counties selected as research sites were designated as economically depressed areas of high youth unemployment and area of high school dropouts. The remaining five counties were located in areas of high youth unemployment, but with low school dropout rates.

By utilizing counties with both high and low dropout rates, an attempt was made to identify those strategies pertaining to recruitment and retention of disadvantaged students which differentiated successful programs (high completion rates) from unsuccessful programs (low completion rates).

A computer analysis (SPSS) was performed to determine the general agreement among the responding vocational education teachers regarding the obstacle and success factor items in the questionnaire. Subprogram RELIABILITY was used to perform Friedman's analysis of variance on ranks and to calculate Kendall's coefficient of concordance (Tau).

Results and Discussion

The teacher survey instruments produced information on the effectiveness of instructional and evaluation techniques in teaching vocational education to disadvantaged students. Information was also supplied on successful strategies in recruiting disadvantaged students as well as

obstacles which prevented them from successful completing vocational education programs.

Obstacles to enrolling in vocational education programs. Table 1 examines what vocational education teachers perceive to be the obstacles to enrollment in vocational education programs.

Sixty-five percent of the teacher respondents were in agreement that "fear of trying" rather than "poor image" is the major obstacle to successful completion of vocational education programs. This finding varies from previous studies which stated that vocational education students have a negative and poor image which prevents them from being successful in school. There was also general agreement that there are other contributing factors which prevent enrollment in vocational education programs. Fear of accepting responsibility (62%); poor work attitudes (59%); and lack of information about vocational education programs and employment possibilities (56%).

Obstacles to succeeding in vocational education programs. The obstacles teachers cited which prevent success in vocational education programs varied widely with 64 percent citing "students do not complete assignments on time"; 72 percent "easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skills"; 82 percent "attained low academic achievement"; 76 percent "printed materials are difficult to read"; and 67 percent said "there is a lack of school finances to acquire materials in multiple modes and levels, support services, and aides" (See Table 2).

Successful recruitment strategies. When teachers were asked to identify successful strategies for recruiting the disadvantaged student into vocational education programs, a majority (80%) identified personal contacts by past students and acquaintances whereas only 54 percent reported that public awareness by printed and broadcast media were successful recruitment strategies. Sixty-three percent identified personal contact with parents; 78 percent indicated referral by guidance counselors as other successful recruitment strategies (See Table 3).

Successful teaching techniques. Teachers were also requested to identify successful techniques in educating the disadvantaged student. More than 90 percent reported that individualized instruction was a successful technique; while 94 percent indicated that "hands on" experiences are also successful techniques. Ninety-one percent of the teachers indicated teacher made printed materials were successful instructional techniques in teaching vocational education to the disadvantaged. A large number of respondents (88%) indicated that teacher made audio and visual material may be successful in educating these individuals (See Table 4).

Successful evaluation techniques. Only 46 percent of teachers indicated that I.Q. testing is successful as a technique in evaluating disadvantaged students for vocational education programs. The majority of teacher respondents (65%) felt that teacher evaluation was successful technique while (66%) indicated that personal interviews with counselors were more successful (See Table 5).

TABLE 1

Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Obstacles Which Prevent Disadvantaged Students From Enrolling in Vocational Programs

N = 128

Item Obstacles to Enrollment	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Poor Self-Image	28	22	23	18	53	41	20	16	4	3
B. Lack of Confidence	24	19	19	15	63	49	18	14	4	3
C. Fear of Trying	23	18	20	16	63	49	21	16	1	1
D. Hostile Attitude	31	24	16	13	36	28	37	29	3	6
E. Fear of Accepting Responsibility	23	18	15	12	64	50	22	17	4	3
F. Poor Work Attitude	23	18	25	20	50	39	24	19	6	5
G. Poor Attendance	28	22	16	13	39	31	37	29	7	6
H. Lack of Information About Vocational Programs and Employment Possibilities	21	16	21	16	51	40	30	23	5	4
I. Belief That Vocational Education Offers Training for Menial or Low Level Jobs	35	28	11	9	19	15	52	41	10	8
J. Teachers Low Expectations	24	19	11	9	22	17	54	42	17	13
K. Students' Prejudice	28	22	8	6	39	30	42	33	11	9
L. Teacher Fear That Not Enough Time is Available to Adequately Serve Disadvantaged Students	24	19	11	9	43	34	39	30	11	9
M. Teacher Fear of Watering Down Courses for Disadvantaged Students	23	18	9	7	35	27	46	36	15	12
N. Teacher Fear that Disadvantaged Students Would Be Discipline Problems	19	15	18	14	42	33	39	31	8	6

TABLE 2

Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Obstacles Which Prevent Disadvantaged Students From Succeeding in Vocational Programs

N = 128

Item Obstacles to Success	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. They Do Not Complete Assignments on Time	13	10	18	14	46	36	43	34	7	6
B. They Lack Interest in Class	19	15	9	7	51	40	42	33	7	5
C. They Are Easily Frustrated with Their Rate of Progress in Acquiring Skills	13	10	13	10	59	46	36	28	6	5
D. They Lack Motivation	13	10	16	13	53	41	42	33	4	3
E. They Cannot Adjust to Class Discipline	22	17	11	9	28	22	61	48	6	5
F. They Have a High Rate of Absenteeism	30	23	16	13	28	22	49	38	5	4
G. They Have Attained Low Academic Achievement	18	14	14	11	68	53	25	20	3	2
H. They Are Unable to Perform Well in Their Preferred Vocational Area	22	17	8	6	42	33	53	41	3	2
I. Teachers Are Unable or Unwilling to Provide Extra Time and Effort for Disadvantaged Students	16	13	11	9	29	23	55	43	17	13
J. Teachers Become Discouraged at Students' Rate of Progress	17	13	5	4	45	35	53	41	8	6
K. Strained Relationships Exist Between Academically Disadvantaged Students and Those with Higher Academic Achievement	17	13	5	4	41	32	58	46	6	5
L. Remedial Instruction Is Not Effective	18	14	7	5	43	34	47	37	13	10
M. Printed Materials Are Difficult to Read	15	12	15	12	61	48	34	27	3	2
N. Audio/Visual Materials Are Difficult to Read	16	13	5	4	38	30	63	49	6	5
O. Lack of School Finances to Acquire Materials in Multiple Modes and Levels, Support Services, and Aides	28	22	24	19	43	34	30	24	2	2

TABLE 3

Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Recruitment Strategies for Disadvantaged Students

N = 128

Item Recruitment Strategies	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Personal Contacts By Past Students and Acquaintances	20	16	45	35	58	45	3	2	2	2
B. Public Awareness By Printed and Broadcast Media	35	27	20	16	48	38	24	19	1	1
C. Personal Contact with Parents	34	27	24	19	56	44	14	11	0	0
D. Referral By Guidance Counselor and/or School	24	19	25	20	61	48	15	12	3	2
E. Advertisements Sent to Parents	50	39	6	5	43	34	27	21	2	2
F. Community Organizations	31	24	25	20	52	41	17	13	3	2

TABLE 4

Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Teaching Techniques for Disadvantaged Students

N = 128

Item Techniques/Materials	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Individualized Instruction	6	5	65	51	53	41	2	2	2	2
B. Peer Tutoring	13	10	26	20	74	58	14	11	1	1
C. "Hands On" Experiences	7	5	81	63	40	31	0	0	0	0
D. Behavior Modification Methods	33	26	32	25	54	42	8	6	1	1
E. Competency-Based Instruction	8	6	54	42	51	40	14	11	1	1
F. Field Trips	18	14	30	23	64	50	16	13	0	0
G. Commercially Prepared Audio/Visual Materials	13	10	36	28	70	55	8	6	1	1
H. Commercially Prepared Printed Materials	13	10	28	22	63	49	21	16	3	2
I. Teacher-Made Audio/Visual Materials	14	11	37	29	76	59	1	1	0	0
J. Teacher-Made Printed Materials	9	7	37	29	79	62	2	2	0	0
K. Special Counselors and Individual Counseling	17	13	43	34	59	46	8	6	1	1
L. Buddy Systems	25	20	30	23	52	41	20	16	1	1
M. Remedial Instruction Related to Shop Experiences	33	26	39	30	50	39	6	5	0	0
N. Teacher Aides	37	29	35	27	43	34	10	8	3	2

TABLE 5

Frequency and Percent of Ratings of Successful Evaluation Techniques for Disadvantaged Students

N = 128

Item Evaluation Techniques	NB		SA		A		D		SD	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. I. Q. Testing	45	35	14	11	44	35	21	17	3	2
B. Teacher Evaluation	26	20	22	17	61	48	16	13	3	2
C. Job-Training Evaluation	36	28	13	10	58	46	20	16	0	0
D. Counselor Interpretation of Tests	40	31	9	7	49	39	27	21	2	2
E. Personal Interview with Counselor	31	24	27	21	58	45	12	9	0	0

While the data presented in Tables 1-5 reflects general agreement among the respondents, there were some items which reflected less agreement than others.

It was, therefore, necessary to establish a predetermined point at or above which the standard deviation would indicate general agreement among respondents. Accordingly a standard deviation of < 1.00 was established as a "cut-off" point and was applied to the item ratings represented in tables 6-9. Thus, the lower the standard deviation, the greater the agreement among the respondents.

Table 6 indicates that the teachers' survey instrument generated results that are inconsistent with the perceptions or beliefs about the poor self image" expressed by a 1978 study (Egginton, 1978). Egginton indicated that "vocational education students tend to have poorer self-images and more negative attitudes toward academic learning than other students and these feelings are sustained for the older, male, minority, and lower-income student" p. 534. However, in this study there was not high agreement that "poor self image" was an obstacle to enrollment. A standard deviation of .98 indicated the high agreement among vocational teachers that "fear of trying" is the major obstacle to enrollment.

Identifying obstacles to successful completion of vocational education programs was one of the goals of this study. Table 7 gives an analysis of the vocational education teachers' responses which indicated that three of the four obstacles to successful completion are what the Simcoe (1978) study described as "student based": (a) they are easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skills, (b) they lack motivation, and (c) they have attained low academic achievement, as opposed to program based (printed materials are difficult to read). The pattern of standard deviation scores should be noted in this table. A range of scores .97 - .99 indicates high agreement among the first four items; 1.05 - 1.09 moderate agreement on the next five items; 1.10 - 1.26 low agreement on the remaining items. It was significant to note that teachers did not believe that class discipline and absenteeism were obstacles to successful programs. Apparently, the vocational teachers believe that these negative behaviors did not exist in their classes.

Another task of this study was to identify teaching techniques which believed would increase the retention rates of the disadvantaged. An investigation of Table 8 reveals that teachers were in highest agreement that "hands on" experiences are the most effective in educating these individuals. However, the respondents also agreed that a variety of techniques from "teacher-made printed materials" to behavior modification methods and peer tutoring should be incorporated when teaching the disadvantaged student. A standard deviation score of 1.04 indicates that teachers did not feel that teacher aides were necessary in order to have a successful program.

The analysis of variance resulted in a Chi square value of 681.156 which exceeded the tabled value at the .05 probability level; and, therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference in the teachers' mean ranks was rejected. The calculated Kendall's coefficient of concordance, (.077) was consistent with the Chi square statistic and indicated nonagreement among

TABLE 6

Ratings by Vocational Educators of Obstacles to Enrollment in Vocational Education Programs

N = 128

Obstacle to Enrollment	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fear of trying	2.66	.98
Lack of confidence	2.68	1.03
Fear of accepting responsibility	2.76	1.04
Lack of information about vocational education programs and employment possibilities	2.60	1.09
Poor self-image	2.82	1.09
Poor work attitude	2.73	1.11
Teacher fear that disadvantaged students would be discipline problems	2.99	1.15
Teacher fear that not enough time is available to adequately serve disadvantaged students	3.02	1.22
Poor attendance	2.83	1.23
Hostile attitude	2.80	1.27
Students' prejudice	3.00	1.27
Teacher fear of watering down courses for disadvantaged students	3.16	1.27
Teachers' low expectations	3.23	1.32
Belief that vocational education offers training for menial or low level jobs	2.93	1.39

TABLE 7

Ratings by Vocational Educators of Obstacles to Success in Vocational Education Programs

N = 128

Obstacle to Success	Mean	Standard Deviation
Students have attained low academic achievement	2.85	.97
Printed materials are difficult to read	2.96	.98
Students lack motivation	3.06	.99
Students are easily frustrated with their rate of progress in acquiring skills	3.07	.99
Students do not complete assignments on time	3.10	1.05
Audio/visual materials are difficult to read	3.30	1.07
Strained relationships exist between academically disadvantaged students and students with higher academic achievement	3.24	1.08
Teachers become discouraged at students' rate of progress	3.23	1.09
Students lack interest in class	3.07	1.10
Lack of school finances to acquire materials in multiple modes and levels, and lack of support services and aides	2.64	1.12
Students are unable to perform well in their preferred vocational area	3.05	1.12
Remedial instruction is not effective	3.23	1.16
Students cannot adjust to class discipline	3.14	1.20
Teachers are unwilling or unable to provide extra time and effort for disadvantaged students	3.36	1.20
Students have a high rate of absenteeism	2.87	1.26

Table 8
Ratings by Vocational Educators of Successful Teaching Techniques
N = 128

Technique	Mean	Standard Deviation
"Hands on" experience	2.26	.55
Teacher-made printed materials	2.58	.65
Individualized instruction	2.45	.69
Teacher-made audio/visual materials	2.50	.70
Commercially prepared audio/visual materials	2.59	.79
Competancy-based instruction	2.58	.80
Peer tutoring	2.72	.82
Special counselors and individual counseling	2.48	.83
Field trips	2.61	.88
Remedial instruction related to shop experience	2.23	.89
Commerically prepared printed materials	2.79	.92
Behavior modification methods	2.31	.95
Buddy systems	2.55	1.00
Teacher aides	2.27	1.04

Table 9

Analysis of Variance and Kendall's Tau using Subprogram
RELIABILITY of Obstacles and Success Factors based on
Rankings by Vocational Educators

Source of Variation	Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Chi Square	Significance
Between people	1897.72555	127	14.94272		
Within people	6365.72222	6784	.93834		
Between measures	639.15871	53	12.05960	681.156	*.0001
Residual	5726.56351	6731	.85077		
Total	8263.44777	6911	1.19569		

Grand Mean = 1.74725

Coefficient of Concordance W = .077

*p 0.05

the teachers about the rankings of the obstacle and success factor items. The range of Kendall's coefficient of concordance is +1 (complete concordance) to -1 (complete disagreement). These data are summarized in Table 9.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The purpose of this study was to identify recruitment practices and strategies for increasing retention of disadvantaged students in occupational proficient programs.

It is recommended that attention be given to the systematic investigation of obstacles that prevent enrollment and success in vocational program. In addition, further investigation should be conducted on the reasons why vocationally disadvantaged students say they do not complete vocational education programs once they do enroll. Comparison may then be made between what vocational educators perceive as the reason for lack of success, and what students perceive about their lack of success.

Bibliography

- Almen, Emmanuel R. "The Evaluation of a Vocational Program for Dropout-Prone Junior High School Students," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1981.
- Bottoms, Gene and Copa, Patricia. "A Perspective on Vocational Education Today." Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 348-354.
- Cohen, Eli E. and Seldin, Joe. Unemployed youth and depressed area school. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), Reaching the Disadvantaged. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.
- David, Henry and Hendrickson, Gerry. "The NIE Report on Vocational Education." Vocational Education, January/February, 1982, pp. 48-51.
- Egginton, Everett. "Is Vocational Education Meeting Its Objectives?" Phi Delta Kappan, 60, September, 1978 - June, 1979, pp. 533-534.
- Falkenstine, James C. "A Study of School Dropouts in Bourbon County to Determine Their Needs for Vocational Education." Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1965.
- Feldman, Marvin J. Public education and manpower development. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), Reaching the Disadvantaged. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.
- Finley, Mary J.; Norris, Carol; and Wheeler, Linda. Special Report: The Dropout Problem. Phoenix, Arizona: EDRS Document Reproduction Service, ED 209265, 1980.
- Meade, Edward J., Jr. Vocational and technical education for disadvantaged youth: a critical look. In A. Harry Passow (Ed.), Developing Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.
- Parson, Edgar; Hughes, James H.; and Rice, Eric. Assessment of Needs in Programs of Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: System Sciences Incorporated, 1975.
- Passow, A. Harry (Ed.). Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.
- Phillips, C.V. Diversity of special groups: Description and needs. In Wall (Ed.), Vocational Education for Special Groups. Washington, D.C.: The American Vocational Association, 1976.
- Profile Development Associates. Factors Affecting Vocational Program Levers In New Hampshire. Sutton Mills, New Hampshire: EDRS Document Reproduction Service, ED 221670, 1982

Riddle, Jack F. "Make the Structure Flexible." Vocational Education, January-February, 1981, p. 50.

Scoggins, Leland C. "Causes for Dropouts in High Schools of Natchitoches Parish with Implications for a Vocationally Oriented Program." Ph.D. Dissertation, The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1971.

Simcoe, Arnell. Vocational Equal Access Research Project Report. Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, 1979.

Speer, Charles S. "A Study of Dropouts Among Vocational High School Pupils with Respect to Attitude toward School." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1964.

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary. "Equal Employment Opportunity in Apprenticeship Training." Federal Register, 43 (May 12, 1978).

U.S. Department of Labor, The Manpower Report of the President. 1975. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Tallahassee Democrat, Tallahassee, FL: September 4, 1982.

Waldman, Elizabeth and McEaddy, Beverly J. "Where Women Work--An Analysis by Industry and Occupation." Monthly Labor Review, 97 (May 1974): 3-13.

Weisberg, Alan. "What Research Has to Say About Vocational Education and the High Schools." Phil Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 355-359.

Walsh, J. and Totten, J.L. An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged under Part A and Part B, Section 102(6) of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Corporation, 1976.

THE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION IN CVAE AND WORK EXPERIENCE
ON THE BASIC EMPLOYMENT SKILLS AND WORK ATTITUDES
OF DISADVANTAGED HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH

by
G. Ruth Gibson
Assistant Professor and Special Needs Coordinator
Vocational and Career Development Department
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Technology, which has enabled human beings to send exploratory missions into the solar system and to reach the moon, has also resulted in rapid changes in the world of work. At the same time, education and preparation for employment in this advancing technological age has lagged behind. Each decade has provided a focus for educational endeavors. In the 1960's it was "equality" and "relevance;" in the 1970's it was "accountability." These catch words have not lost their impact, but in the 1970's and 1980's a new focus evolved: "employability." "Taxpayers want schools that will provide their young with skills that will make them employable." (Ferrin & Arbeiter, 1975, p. 1). Recently this focal point has had as its theme, "back to the basics." Emerged in this concept is preparation to enter a "high tech" society.

Employment has proven plentiful for persons with adequate technical skills, even during periods of recession. Persons without such skills to sell in the market place, or without the ability to sell the skills that they do have, face considerable difficulties in finding meaningful employment. In the past, unskilled manual jobs were a basis from which to start a career and were plentiful for youth who had little training or education. However, over the last decade, there has been a steady decline in the number of unskilled jobs available. Technology is replacing human muscle and robotics engineering is providing the source to end hazardous routine work on the assembly line. The continually rising cost of employment (insurance, fringe benefits, inflation, government regulated paperwork, and the minimum wage requirements) is also obliterating former opportunities for low-skill threshold work experiences. As early as 1970, 91% of all jobs required a high school degree (Westcott, 1977).

A January, 1980, White House Background Report emphasized that the traditional picture of the American workplace will soon no longer be accurate as the post-industrial economy is service-oriented, white collar, and technical. Service jobs in the past 30 years have grown 120%, while manufacturing jobs have grown only 30%. The professionals' and managers' category of jobs increased from 1 in 12 in 1965 to 1 in 4 in 1980 (White House Press Office, January, 1980).

Unemployment, a critical problem facing youth today, is viewed as a serious national problem (Gess, 1978; Sullivan, 1979). Present-day teenagers comprise only one-tenth of the nation's labor force but they comprise one-fourth of the unemployed (Green, 1978). Between October, 1967, and October, 1976, the overall rate of teenage unemployment rose from 13.5% to 18.2%, while it increased to 23% in the central cities' area (Westcott, 1977; Zell, 1978). By 1979, after four years of extraordinary job expansion, the unemployment rate for teenagers still averaged 16.1%, compared to 5.8% for the total work force. The rate for black and other minority teenagers was 33.5% (Employment and Training Report of the President, 1980). The unemployment rate for teenagers continued to rise through December 1982 when it reached 24.5%. The rate for unemployed black teenagers had climbed to 48.1% by July of 1983 in comparison to white teenage unemployment of 19.5%. (Monthly Labor Review, 1983)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to Venn (1975), when young people were at home on the farm they were given responsibilities to fulfill and were able to use their muscles to the advantage of the family. They were a necessary part of the team. Children went to school to learn the few things that could not be learned in the home or to receive an educational base to become a member of a specific profession. As parents have moved their major productive activities away from the home, young people have been excluded from the modeling of meaningful adult work roles. This exclusion has been further reinforced by changes in the family structure, increased leisure time, television, and a society of surfeit rather than need. In turn, our educational systems often prolong a dependent state for youth rather than encourage a significant transition from school to the adult workplace. Many school systems today are adding additional coursework to be taken before graduation. Venn (1976) also emphasized that few young people "adequately tie the learning in school to the reality of work in a technological society." (p. 1).

For 63 years, vocational education instruction in America's high schools has provided young people the opportunity to leave school with a saleable entry-level skill, although the number of students served has comprised only a small part of the general school population. Many students leaving high school today are deficient in basic academic skills as well as in vocational skills. Former President Carter stated in his "Youth Education and Employment Proposals for 1980" that the lack of basic skills is the most serious barrier for young people for successful entry into the labor market. For several million youth each year, the transition from school to jobs or further education and training does not appear to be effective. Threshold work experiences apparently play a critical role in a young person's life sequence (Adams & Mangrum, 1978; Ferrin & Arbeiter, 1975; Freeman & Wise, 1979; Reubens, 1977).

The January, 1980, Background Report by the White House Press Office on "Youth Employment Initiatives" stated that "four major groups bear a disproportionate share of unemployment."

1. High school dropouts. Unemployment rates for high school dropouts are two to three times those of high school graduates, with the dropout rate for blacks set at 25% and 40% for Hispanics.

2. Women. Female workers enter the employment market at an earlier age, as a rule, but by age 25 they earn only 65% of the average male wages. (Labor force participation of female teenagers is low in all areas, but exceptionally low for young black women who are less likely to be enrolled in school and more likely to be mothers (Westcott, 1977, p. 16).

3. Teenagers. In 1955 the white teenager unemployment rate was 13%, while the rate for black teenagers was 16%. In 1979 the white teenager unemployment rate was about the same, but the black youth unemployment rate had risen to 33%. A contributing factor, still in evidence, is that while the overall number of teenagers has declined, the number of minority teenagers has continued to grow. (The latest statistics show a 48% black teenager unemployment rate. Monthly Labor Review, 1983).

4. Economically depressed teenagers. When teenagers who fit the category of economic disadvantage enter the labor market they usually do so at lower wages and never catch up.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Private sector employers have told the President's Task Force on Unemployment that "they want employees who can read and write and have demonstrated a reliable work history" (White House Fact Sheet, 1980). Therefore, disadvantaged youth must develop basic academic skills as well as job-seeking, job-getting, and job-holding skills in order to successfully compete in the workplace of the 1980's.

Federal Response to Youth Unemployment

In reaction to the youth unemployment problem, Congress enacted legislation authorizing supplementary funds to aid states in providing vocational education, training, and support services for disadvantaged young people.

According to Resurge '79, the HEW-USOE manual for identifying, classifying, and serving the disadvantaged and handicapped under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976,

the classification system for the disadvantaged is designed to include all persons who have academic or economic handicaps and who require special services and assistance to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs. (p. 15)

"Academic disadvantage" was defined in the Federal Register as a person who lacked reading, writing, and/or mathematical skills or who performed below grade level. This included limited English speaking students. "Economic disadvantage" for these purposes was defined as (1) having family income below the national poverty level, (2) the student, their parent(s) or guardian(s) were unemployed and/or were on public assistance, or (3) the student was institutionalized (Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 191, Section 104.804).

Since 1963 federal legislation for vocational education has emphasized support services for disadvantaged and handicapped students designed to enable them to be successful in vocational education programs. The 1963 law simply stated that special needs students were to be served by vocational education. However, in 1968, states were required to spend 25% of their basic grant for special needs students -- 15% for the disadvantaged and 10% for the handicapped. Under Title II of the 1976 Education Amendments (P.L. 94-482), the amount was increased to 30%--10% for the handicapped programs and 20% for the disadvantaged. Title II further required that these funds be matched dollar for dollar at the state and/or local level. The money for the disadvantaged was to be used to provide supplemental services and programs to help students succeed in regular vocational education programs (Resurge '79, p. 1).

Georgia's Response to Federal Legislation

In Georgia's secondary schools, one aspect of the support services provided for disadvantaged youth has been the Coordinated Vocational Academic Education Program (hereafter indicated as CVAE). The program in Georgia is described as:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4

The CVAE program is designed to remediate underachieving, disadvantaged, alienated youth whose behavioral patterns, lack of basic skills and previous school records indicate a high probability that they will not be able to succeed in the regular secondary vocational programs and/or are economically deprived. (Gibson & Baldwin, 1977, p. 1)

"Many youth require a more concrete type of learning experience—that is, learning by doing or active involvement—if they are to adequately master basic skills" (Georgia State Department of Education, 1970). Orientation to the world of work through a relevant curriculum, vocational education, vocational guidance, and exploratory work experience helps students to see greater meaning both in work and in their educational experience, and will ease the transition from school to work (Lee, 1976).

Special programs for disadvantaged high school students across the U.S. have traditionally emphasized employment skills in their curricula (Wircenski, 1979). CVAE is an intervention program designed to help disadvantaged high school youth develop basic employability skills and responsible attitudes toward work. Employment skills and work attitudes have been taught as part of the regular CVAE curriculum; these skills and attitudes have also been learned in on-the-job situations as an exploratory work experience and job placement component has been part of the CVAE program since its inception (Gibson, 1977; "Site Report No. 2," 1979).

There has been some controversy during the past two decades concerning the value of work experience and career education programs for the disadvantaged. In Georgia, as of March, 1980, there had been no studies to evaluate the CVAE program to identify the effects associated with program participation, work experience, employment skills, and attitudes toward work.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Since the unemployment rate for disadvantaged youth is higher than for other comparable youth groups, it is even more essential that these students develop adequate employment skills and acceptable work attitudes that will enhance not only the probability of employment but also job maintenance. This study was designed to investigate the effect of participation in the first-year CVAE program (Status) and the effect of participation in work experience (Work) on the knowledge of basic employment skills and work attitudes of disadvantaged youth in selected Georgia high schools, as measured by the six subtests of Part I and Part II of the Program for Assessing Youth Employment Skills (PAYES)

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Methods

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of participation in the first-year CVAE program (Status) and work experience (Work)

on the knowledge of basic employment skills and work attitudes of disadvantaged youth enrolled in the CVAE I program in selected Georgia high schools. The study compared the scores on the six subjects of Part I and Part II of the PAYES attained by first-year CVAE completers with those of new CVAE students enrolled in the Georgia CVAE program. The ex post facto research design used in this study is illustrated in Figure 1. F-tests, using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and t tests were used with the conventional .05 level of significance established to reject four null hypotheses of the study.

FACTORS		MEASUREMENTS	
Status	Work Experience	Work Attitudes	Cognitive Measures of Employment Skills
Group I CVAE I Completers	Work Experience	A, B, C	A, B, C
	No Work Experience	A, B, C	A, B, C
Group II New CVAE Students	Work Experience	A, B, C	A, B, C
	No Work Experience	A, B, C	A, B, C

Figure 1. Research design.

The factors used in Figure 1 have the following definitions.

Status. The term "status" was defined as follows:

1. Group I—CVAE completers: those students who were completing their first year in the CVAE program in the spring of 1980;
2. Group II—new CVAE students: those students who enrolled in the CVAE programs in the same schools in the fall in 1980.

Work. The term "work" was used as follows:

1. Work Experience: a factor to indicate subjects who participated in some type of valid work experience. For the purpose of this study, students were identified as having work experience if they had participated in either a school-supervised work experience activity for a minimum of three months, or had held a job acquired through their own initiative for three months or more before entering the CVAE program.
2. No Work Experience: a factor to indicate subjects who indicated that they had not participated in valid work experience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Measurements. The Program for Assessing Youth Employment Skills (PAYES) which was used as the testing instrument, has two parts and six subtests.

Part I: Attitudinal Measures

- IA: Job-Holding Skills
- IB: Attitude Toward Supervision
- IC: Self-Confidence

Part II: Cognitive Measures

- IIA: Job Knowledge
- IIB: Job-Seeking Skills
- IIC: Practical Reasoning

The PAYES was developed specifically to test disadvantaged adolescents and young adults with low verbal skills in the areas listed above. It has pictures to help clarify the questions and is intended to be administered orally to small groups. Development of the PAYES by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) began in 1967 under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Labor. The purpose was to research and design a test appropriate for assessment of unemployed school dropouts and minority youth. It was designed to be specifically "useful for enrollees in CETA centers, skills centers, vocational high school special needs classes, adult basic education centers, and youths in correctional institutions" (Educational Testing Service, 1979, p. 1).

Each subject from Groups I and II completed Parts I and II of the PAYES test battery, which were then computer scored. The data were statistically analyzed for significance and the results were used to test the four null hypotheses used in the study.

Type of Research

A 2x2 (Status x Work) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed for the purposes of comparing the Status means of the CVAE I completers with those of the new CVAE students on the six subtest scores of the PAYES. The analysis was also conducted to compare the means of the CVAE students who had work experience with those who had no work experience on the six subtest scores of the PAYES. Status and Work were the two independent variables, while the PAYES subtests were the six dependent variables.

PROCEDURES

Population and Sample Size

The finite population (N) for this study consisted of 151 CVAE programs for disadvantaged secondary vocational students operating in the state of Georgia in 1980. These programs were located in six geographic regions throughout Georgia. Of these 151 CVAE programs, 23 programs (n) were randomly selected using a cluster sampling technique. Five additional programs were randomly selected to provide for a larger sample. The regional structure and the list of programs were obtained from the State Department of Education, Office of Vocational Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collection of Data

A schedule of testing was devised and a pilot test site chosen. Necessary revisions of instructions were made as a result of the pilot test site. Two classes of CVAE students, who were completing their first year in CVAE in the spring of 1980, were randomly selected in each school and tested by their program coordinators. In the fall of 1980, two classes of new CVAE students, who had recently enrolled in the CVAE I programs in the participating schools, were tested. The answer sheets were computer scored and the results used in the statistical analysis.

Of the 28 schools originally included in the study, five schools had to be dropped from the final data analysis. After removal of unusable or incomplete score sheets, 1,122 students made up the final number of subjects.

RESULTS-FINDINGS

The four null hypotheses used in the study were rejected at the .001 level of significance. Participation for one year in the CVAE program had a significant effect on the scores achieved on the PAYES by CVAE I completers compared to new CVAE students (Hypothesis I). The results validated significant main effects for the independent variables Status and Work, $p < .001$ (See Table 1).

The statistical analysis indicated that disadvantaged students, who had completed one year in the CVAE program, had significantly higher scores than did the new CVAE students on four of the six subtests. The multivariate F was significant at the .001 level. Two subtests, Attitude Toward Supervision and Self-Confidence, were not significant, but showed a positive direction. Univariate F 's were significant at the .05 level for Job-Holding Skills and the .001 level for Job Knowledge, Job-Seeking Skills, and Practical Reasoning. (See Table 2)

Table 1
Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Variance with
Six Dependent Variables: Job-Holding Skills,
Attitude Toward Supervision, Self-Confidence,
Job Knowledge, Job-Seeking Skills, and
Practical Reasoning Test Scores

Source	df	F
Status	6, 1113	5.663*
Work	6, 1113	7.192*
Status x Work	6, 1113	.616 n.s.

* $p < .001$

n.s. = Nonsignificant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Summary of Univariate Analysis of Variance of Six
Dependent Variables for the Main Effect
of Status

Source	df	MS	F
I-A Job-Holding Skills	1, 1118	45.812	4.605*
I-B Attitude Toward Supervision	1, 1118	6.965	.092 n.s.
I-C Self-Confidence	1, 1118	12.336	.943 n.s.
II-A Job Knowledge	1, 1118	330.198	11.785**
II-B Job-Seeking Skills	1, 1118	158.391	12.127**
II-C Practical Reasoning	1, 1118	386.234	19.761**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

n.s. = nonsignificant

Participation in work experience had a significant effect on the scores achieved on the PAYES by CVAE subjects (Hypotheses II, III, and IV). Interaction effects for Status and Work were not significant. In every instance, the CVAE students who had participated in work experience scored significantly higher ($p < .01$ or $p < .001$ levels) on the six subtests of the PAYES than did CVAE students who had no work experience. (See Table 3, Hypothesis II)

Table 3
Summary of Univariate Analysis of Variance
of Six Dependent Variables for the
Main Effect of Work

Source	df	MS	F
I-A Job-Holding Skills	1, 1118	85.636	8.609*
I-B Attitude Toward Supervision	1, 1118	1375.835	18.237**
I-C Self-Confidence	1, 1118	88.534	6.765*
II-A Job Knowledge	1, 1118	610.029	21.772**
II-B Job-Seeking Skills	1, 1118	314.836	24.105**
II-C Practical Reasoning	1, 1118	447.822	22.912**

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* Table 4
Summary of the t Values of CVAE I Completers, Work
Experience Compared to No Work Experience
on Six Dependent Variables

Source	Mean Difference	$SE_{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}$	df	t Value
I-A Job-Holding Skills	3.94	.275	599	1.43 n.s.
I-B Attitude Toward Supervision	2.111	.713	599	2.96**
I-C Self-Confidence	.770	.305	599	2.53*
II-A Job Knowledge	1.715	.435	599	3.94***
II-B Job-Seeking Skills	1.256	.308	599	4.08***
II-C Practical Reasoning	1.335	.369	599	3.62***

* p .05

** p .01

*** p .001

n.s. = nonsignificant

Five of the six subtest means for comparison of CVAE I Completers with work experience to CVAE I Completers with no work experience were statistically significant summarization of t tests in Table 4. (Hypothesis III).

The t -tests for differences between the means were employed for new CVAE students with work experience and new CVAE students with no work experience. Five of the six subtests showed statistical significance at the .01 level. In every case, the new CVAE students with work experience scored higher than those with no work experience. The summary of results is found in Table 5 (Hypothesis IV).

Table 5
Summary of the t Values of New CVAE Students, Work
Experience Compared to No Work Experience,
on Six Dependent Variables

Source	Mean Difference	$SE_{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}$	df	t Value
I-A Job-Holding Skills	.742	.255	519	2.91*
I-B Attitude Toward Supervision	2.364	.769	519	3.07*
I-C Self-Confidence	.330	.307	519	1.08 n.s.
II-A Job Knowledge	1.219	.473	519	2.58*
II-B Job-Seeking Skills	1.848	.310	519	2.74*
II-C Practical Reasoning	1.199	.385	519	3.11*

* p < .01

n.s. = nonsignificant

Conclusions

It was concluded that:

1. Participation in the CVAE program for one year and/or in work experience enhanced both the attitudes of the CVAE I students toward work and their cognitive knowledge of basic employment skills.
2. The PAYES appears to be an appropriate instrument for assessing the work attitudes and knowledge of basic employment skills for disadvantaged youth.

Specifically:

a. Subtest IA - Job-Holding Skills

The data supported the conclusion that the majority of the CVAE I subjects, both completers and new enrollees, were aware of the behaviors necessary to hold a job. All subjects, except for the new male CVAE students with no work experience, scored within the suggested high score band. Although this subtest had an apparent "ceiling effect," its usefulness would be to identify those students with low scores so that counseling and instruction in this area could be initiated.

b. Subtest IB - Attitude Toward Supervision

It is evident from this subtest that there was a wide dispersion of the mean scores between subject groups with work experience compared to those with no work experience. The higher scores indicated that attitudes toward supervision were positively affected by subject participation in work experience. However, as the mean scores for all subjects were below recommended levels, the researcher was unable to conclude if these low scores were the result of continued poor attitudes, which are common to CVAE students, or if the abstract wording of the questions for this particular subtest was responsible for the low scores.

c. Subtest IC - Self-Confidence

Means for subtest I-C were below the suggested high score band by 5%. Research by the developers of the PAYES supports the conclusion that when scores on Self-Confidence do not reach the suggested levels, and when these scores are combined with low scores in Job-Seeking Skills and Attitudes Toward Supervision, students may be unlikely to follow through properly on job search or display appropriate work behaviors (Educational Testing Service, 1979).

d. Subtest IIA - Job Knowledge

The mean scores on Job Knowledge ranged from 20% to 26% below the suggested high score band. However, both groups with work experience had significantly higher means ($p < .001$) than did the other subjects. The data thus supports the conclusion that work experience reinforces the information that is studied in the CVAE classroom concerning education levels, working hours, and wages for various jobs. The low scores overall may reflect a need for more emphasis in this area.

e. Subtest IIB - Job-Seeking Skills

CVAE I subjects with work experience had higher scores than those with no work experience. CVAE completers had significantly higher means ($p < .001$), but as a total group, the mean scores of the subjects were approximately 40% below the suggested high score band. The data supports the conclusion that although the scores were significant ($p < .001$) between the various groups of subjects, the CVAE I students had not achieved a high competency in this area.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

f. Subtest IIC - Practical Reasoning

The lowest means of all the six subtests were recorded by the CVAE I subjects on Practical Reasoning. The means averaged 45% below the suggested high score band. CVAE completers with work experience had significantly higher scores ($p = .001$) than did the other CVAE subjects. However, the consistently low means for all the subjects indicates a lack of competency in Practical Reasoning.

3. Overall, scores on the PAYES (except for subtest IA - Job-Holding Skills) were low for CVAE I subjects. These may be related to one of several possibilities. (a) Disadvantaged students are not motivated to take tests under the best of circumstances. (b) The testing time period in most cases covered successive days. The interest and motivational level may have dropped for these students, as the scores progressively declined, test by test. (c) The low scores accurately reflect poor attitudes and lack of competencies in basic employment skills; however, since subjects with work experience or those who had participated in CVAE for one year had significantly improved scores, it is concluded that a relative measure of competency had been gained by those subjects.

4. The factors of Status and Work show positive effects on the work attitudes and basic employment skills of CVAE I students in Georgia as measured by the PAYES. Scores for students with work experience were higher than those of students with no work experience. Scores for students with one year in CVAE combined with work experience were the highest on four of the six subtests. Employability is the bottom line for intervention programs such as CVAE. Therefore, it is concluded that students with work experience have achieved a more employable status, while those who have completed one year in CVAE and also have work experience have the knowledge to seek and obtain employment.

5. This study shows CVAE in Georgia to have positive pre-employment performance outcomes. The findings support the contention that programs such as CVAE and participation in work experience improve attitudes toward work, supervision, and self, and increase cognitive knowledge of jobs, job-seeking, and practical reasoning skills as measured by the PAYES.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are from this study.

1. Since scores attained on the PAYES by the CVAE subjects were below suggested competency levels, it is recommended that appropriate activities in the CVAE Curriculum be implemented to improve job knowledge, develop job-seeking and job holding skills, enhance self-confidence, and improve attitudes toward supervision, through counseling activities, and provide extensive practice in following directions.

2. Work experience is a recognized component of the CVAE program. The fact that the highest scores were recorded by those subjects with work experience suggests that this component should not only be included, but should also be emphasized in Georgia CVAE programs.

Implications

Recent syndicated news articles have questioned the validity of vocational education and work experience for high school aged youth. This study was undertaken to test the value of specific programmatic curriculum for disadvantaged students and the value of their work experience in work experience. On the statistical findings of this study, recommendations listed above would seem to have valid implications for other programs desired for disadvantaged youth across the nation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

- Adams, A.V., & Mangum, G.L. The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment. Educational Testing Device. User's Guide: Program for Assessing Youth Employment Skills. Princeton, N.J.: Cambridge Basic Skills Company, 1979.
- Employment and Training Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Federal Register, Vol. 42, No. 191, Section 104.804, Section 195.
- Ferrin, R., & Arbeiter, S. Bridging the Gap: A Study of Education-to-work Linkages. Final Report of the State-Level Study in Career Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.
- Freeman, R.B., & Wise, D.A. NBER Summary Report: Youth Unemployment. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1979.
- Georgia Department of Education. Coordinated Vocational Academic Education. Atlanta, GA: Author, Division of
- Gess, L.R. A national policy for job creation and youth development. Vocational Education, 1978, 53 (6), 43-47.
- Gibson, R. New Kid on the Block: Youth Clubs for Special Needs Students. American Vocational Journal, 1977, 52 (6), 34-42.
- Gibson, R., & Baldwin, B. Coordinated Vocational Academic Education. Unpublished manuscript, Georgia State University, 1977.
- Green, G. Employment and Unemployment Trends during 1977. Monthly Labor Review, 1978, 101 (2), 12-23.
- Lee, J.S. Youth work entry through vocational education. In J.E. Wall (Ed.), Vocational Education for Special Groups, Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1976.
- Resurge '79. Manual for identifying, classifying, and serving the disadvantaged and handicapped under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. (P.L. 94-482). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1979.
- Raubens, B.G. Bridges to Work: International Comparison of Transition Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- Site Report No. 2: Georgia's Winning Way with Alienated Youth. Vocational Educational, March, 1979, pp. 40-41.
- Sullivan, L. Our Unemployed Youth: A National Emergency. Change, 1979, 3 (4), 3-4.
- Venn, G. Work experience and placement programs. Paper presented at the Career Education National Forum, Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, March, 1975.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Monthly Labor Review, August, 1983.
- Venn, G. Work Experience and learning. Paper Presented at the Chief State School Officers 1976 Summer Institute, San Diego, August, 1976.
- Westcott, D.W. The nation's youth: An employment perspective. Worklife, 1977, 2 (6), 13-18.
- White House background report, January, 1980. Washington, D.C.: White House Press Office, January, 1980.
- White House fact sheet. Washington, D.C.: White House Press Office, January, 1980.
- Wircenski, J. Exemplary programs for the disadvantaged: A report of a national study. NAVESNP, 1979.
- Zell, S. Problem of rising teenage unemployment: Reappraisal. Economic Review, 1978, 63 (1), 12-26.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELATED VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION-
A DIFFERENCE IN ATTITUDES OF
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS TOWARD
SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS

Berti Lu Reimers Nations
Related Vocational Instruction Specialist
Griffin High School, Griffin, Georgia

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Vocational education plays an important role in the overall plan of education for the handicapped by maximizing their job entry level skills, their work potential, and their training for the world of work by the time they complete their vocational educational experience. It is imperative that vocational educators and special educators share a common understanding of the handicapped populations they serve. These two groups of educators must be aware of the special needs student's needs and characteristics, and cooperatively plan together in order to prepare the handicapped person for the best job possible (Cook & Engleman, 1978).

Legislative mandates passed over the last several years make it necessary for vocational educators to be trained to deal with the special needs learner (Albright, 1977). Title II of the Education Amendment of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) relates specifically to serving special needs learners and preparing special needs personnel. The focus of this act is the integration or mainstreaming of handicapped and disadvantaged students into regular vocational education programs as much as possible. This act also provides that ten percent of all vocational money be spent on handicapped students (Carlson, 1977; Tindall, 1978).

Another law that has a major impact on the special needs student is the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) which outlines the rights of the handicapped to participate in quality academic and vocational education. This law also provides that each student will have an individual educational plan (the IEP) developed for him. The Vocational IEP provides for each handicapped student enrolled in a vocational program. The Vocational IEP demands careful and concise vocational planning between the vocational educator and the special educator to meet the needs of the individual student (Tindall, 1978).

The intellectual, social and emotional success of handicapped students in the regular classroom is influenced by the educators' attitudes and understanding of special education (Haring, 1957; Haring, Stern & Cruickshank, 1958). In order to successfully intergrade handicapped students into a vocational education program, several authors described in-service programs used to modify existing teacher attitudes.

Harasymiw and Horne (1976) and Meers (1977) discussed ways of educating regular educators of special needs students. They found that teachers' opinions and attitudes on mainstreaming handicapped students could be modified. Two ways of modifying opinions and attitudes were: (1) in-service programs designed to provide teachers with new knowledge about handicapped students, and (2) providing classroom experience in working with special needs students. In-service education made teachers less anxious and fearful in working with handicapped students. It was discovered that prolonged familiarization with various disability groups modified underlying social biases. Harasymiw and Horne (1976) and Meers (1977) found that there were techniques and strategies that could be employed which increased not only the amount of student success but the level of teacher satisfaction.

A higher quality of learning will take place in a situation that has both teacher and learner at ease, and the success rate of the student will be increasingly beneficial to his overall vocational education (Meers, 1977).

A survey, conducted in Iowa, found that approximately seventy-five percent (75%) of vocational instructors had no training in serving special populations. Although the need for in-service instruction received top priority, the instructors made it clear that in-service activities should be complemented by other forms of assistance in order for an effective program to evolve (Greenwood & Morley, 1978).

In Georgia, the legislative mandates for the handicapped are being met through the Related Vocational Instruction (RVI) Program. The goal of this secondary vocational handicapped program is the same as for non-handicapped vocational students in Georgia. Namely this is to provide job entry level skills in broad or specific occupational clusters. Another important goal of the RVI Program is to provide regular vocational teachers with information about the handicapped learner. It is the hope of the RVI Program, that, through this knowledge of handicapped learners, vocational teachers will have better attitudes concerning special needs students and be more receptive to having handicapped students mainstreamed into regular classrooms. The title of Related Vocational Instructor indicates an essential function of this job, which is to provide related vocational instruction to handicapped students entering and participating in the mainstream of vocational education (Taylor & Gill, 1979).

Today there are over one hundred and sixty existing RVI programs throughout the State of Georgia. The handicapped students in the RVI programs have been identified and duly processed as handicapped students. It is the responsibility of the RVI specialist to coordinate the services needed to help the handicapped learner acquire his goal of job placement. An important component of the program is the vocational aspect of an individual educational plan (IEP) which is provided by the coordinated efforts of the regular vocational instructor and the RVI specialist along with the other members of the IEP committee. The Local Education Agency, for each community, incorporates this program into its local system. The implementation of each program depends on the school system's unique situation and facility ("The Related Vocational Instruction Program," 1982).

Conaway (1981) promoted the RVI program as an excellent example of how to provide vocational education for handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. This program provides increased communication between special and vocational educators. It also provides such assets as administrative support, adequate vocational assessment and evaluation, innovative instructional strategies, competent staff, involvement of parents, increased community participation, vocational skills and eventually a job placement.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study was to ascertain if having an RVI program as a support service in a school affected the attitudes of vocational instructors toward the handicapped.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The methodology used in this study was to compare the attitudes of vocational educators with Related Vocational Instruction and vocational educators without Related Vocational Instruction toward Special Needs students in selected areas of Georgia because of the federal mandates which support the RVI program. The hypothesis of this study was that there is no significant difference in the attitudes toward special needs students held by vocational educators that receive RVI support as compared to the attitudes of vocational educators that do not receive RVI support. One hundred and forty-eight regular vocational teachers in twenty-two high schools in two Cooperative Extension Services Areas in Georgia were given "The Mainstreaming Attitude Scale" (adapted from Dr. Barbara Larrivee and Dr. L. Cook (1979)).

RESULTS: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

One hundred and twelve vocational teachers responded to the scale for a return rate of 75.6%. Section I of the attitude scale was used to determine which vocational teachers had RVI support. It was found that seventy-seven of the respondents had RVI support and thirty-five did not. A total score for the responses of the subjects in Section II was determined. A t test for independent variables was used. It was confirmed that the vocational teachers with RVI support (Group 1) had a significantly higher mean score ($p = .001$) than the mean score of the vocational teachers without RVI support (Group 2).

Group One, which was composed of the regular vocational teachers with RVI support, had a mean score of 93.33 with a standard deviation of 13.96 and a measure of standard error of 1.59. Group Two the vocational educators who did not receive RVI support had a total mean score of 86.54 with a standard deviation of 16.49 and a measure of standard error of 2.788. The hypothesis was rejected since the mean total score of Group One was significantly higher ($p = .001$) than the mean score of Group Two.

In view of the findings of this study, it may be concluded that the attitudes of vocational instructors teaching in schools with Related Vocational Instruction differed significantly ($p = .001$) than the attitudes of vocational instructors without Related Vocational Instruction Programs. With the attitudes of regular teachers being a prime factor in the success of the mainstreaming movement, (McDaniel, 1982) the conclusions of this study can be used to demonstrate to administrators that the Related Vocational Instruction Program can be an important component in a successful vocational special needs program at the secondary level.

Recommendations based on this study could include the use of the Related Vocational Instruction Program as an exemplary program for all secondary schools in the United States with vocational programs that serve special need students. Also, continued longitudinal studies should be conducted to determine the effects of the Related Vocational Instruction Program on the attitudes of vocational instructors with mainstreamed special need students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table I
Results of Questions 1-4 of Section I of
the Mainstreaming Attitude Scale Survey

	Response	
	Group One	Group Two
	Regular Vocational Teachers With RVIP Support	Regular Vocational Teachers Without RVIP Support
1. <u>Grade level taught</u>		
7-8	0	1
8-12	0	1
7-12	4	7
9-12	7	2
7-9	0	9
9-10	1	3
11-12	65	12
2. <u>Number of Students in Class</u>		
11-15	3	2
16-20	32	9
21-25	26	12
21-30	2	0
26-30	11	10
31-35	2	2
26-35	1	0
3. <u>Number of Students in Your School</u>		
1-300	0	2
301-600	8	5
601-900	18	19
901-1200	21	9
1200 +	30	0
4. <u>Type of School</u>		
Urban	29	3
Suburban	15	16
Rural	33	16

Table II
Results of Questions 5-7 of Section I of
the Mainstreaming Attitude Scale Survey

	Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Not Apply
5. Degree of Success in Dealing With Special Needs Students - Group One Vocational Teachers With RVIP	2	7	48	14	6	1
Degree of Success in Dealing With Special Needs Students - Group Two Vocational Teachers Without RVIP	4	4	18	8	0	1
6. Level of Administrative Support - Group One Vocational Teachers With RVIP	2	8	32	27	8	0
Level of Administrative Support - Group Two Vocational Teachers Without RVIP	2	6	15	10	1	1
7. Availability of Other Support Services Group One - Vocational Teachers With RVIP	2	9	29	31	6	0
Availability of Other Support Services Group Two - Vocational Teachers Without RVIP	1	6	15	10	2	1

Table III

Results of Question 8 of the
Mainstreaming Attitude Scale Survey

	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Available</u>
8. The availability of related vocational instruction has been:	35	77

Table IV

Results of the t Test of Section II from
the Mainstreaming Attitude Scale Survey

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
Group One (With RVIP)	77	97.3377	13.96	1.591
Group Two (Without RVIP)	35	86.5429	16.491	2.788

Polled Variance Estimate

<u>t Value</u>	<u>Degrees Of Freedom</u>	<u>2-Tail Probability</u>
3.56	110	.001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A SURVEY OF TEACHER'S OPINIONS RELATIVE TO MAINSTREAMING SPECIAL-NEEDS CHILDREN

Recent legislation requires that children with special needs be intergrated into the regular classroom to the extent that such integration is possible. Educators have long realized that one of the most important influences on a child's educational progress is the classroom teacher. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information that will aid school systems in maximizing the classroom teacher's effectiveness with special needs children placed in his/her classroom.

SECTION I: Background Variables

Please circle your response to the following items:

1. Grade level taught K 1-3 4-6 7-9 10-12
2. Number of students
in your class: 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-30 31-35
3. Number of students
in your school: 1-300 301-600 601-900 901-1200 1200+
4. Type of school: Urban Suburban Rural
5. My degree of success
to date in dealing
with special needs
students in the
regular classroom
has been: Very Low Low Average High Very High
6. The level of admini-
strative support I
have received relative
to special needs
students has been: Very Low Low Average High Very High
7. The availability of
other support services
for accommodating
special students such as
resource rooms, resource
teachers, etc. has been: Very Low Low Average High Very High
8. The availability of
related vocational
instruction has been: Not Available Available

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION II: Teacher Opinions

Please circle the number under the column that best describes your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. There are no correct answers; the best answers are those that honestly reflect your feelings.

Scale: SA = Strongly Agree D = Disagree
 A = Agree SD = Strongly Disagree
 U = Undecided

	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for special-needs students.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The needs of handicapped students can best be served through special, separate classes.	1	2	3	4	5
3. A special-needs child's classroom behavior generally requires more patience from the teacher than does the behavior of a normal child.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The challenge of being in a regular classroom will promote the academic growth of the special-needs child.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The extra attention special-needs students require will be to the detriment of the other students.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Mainstreaming offers mixed group interaction which will foster understanding and acceptance of differences.	1	2	3	4	5
7. It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains a special-needs child.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Regular teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with special-needs students.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The behavior of special-needs students will set a bad example for the other students.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of a special-needs student.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The special-needs child will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Most special-needs children do not make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Integration of special-needs children will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Most special-needs children are well behaved in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The contact regular-class students have with mainstreamed students may be harmful.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach children with special needs.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Special-needs students will monopolize the teacher's time.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Mainstreaming the special-needs child will promote his/her social independence.	1	2	3	4	5
19. It is likely that a special-needs child will exhibit behavior problems in a regular classroom setting.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is better done by resource-room or special teachers than by regular-classroom teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The integration of special-needs students can be beneficial for regular students.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Special-needs children need to be told exactly what to do and how to do it.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Mainstreaming is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the special-needs child.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Increased freedom in the classroom creates too much confusion.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The special-needs child will be socially isolated by regular-classroom students.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Parents of a special-needs child present no greater problem for a classroom teacher than those of a normal child.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Integration of special-needs children will necessitate extensive re-training of regular teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Special-needs students should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom setting, where possible.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Special-needs children are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
30. The presence of special-needs students will promote acceptance of differences on the part of regular students.	1	2	3	4	5

Adapted from:

Larrivee, B. & Cook, L. Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitudes. The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13(3), 315-324

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

- Albright, L. Resources for special needs personnel development.
Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 1977, 14(4), 46-55.
- Carlson, R. E. Legislation and special needs teacher education: The vocational amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482).
Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 1977 14(4), 19-22.
- Conaway, C. A. Vocational education serves the handicapped.
Voc Ed, 1981, 56(3), 22-25.
- Cook, J. D. & Engleman, V. Vocational education for the handicapped: Methodology for planning and implementing inservice.
Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1978, 13, 294-297.
- Greenwood, C. & Morley, R. How to operate and in-service activity.
Industrial Education, 1978 67(4), 26-29.
- Harasymiw, S. & Horne, M. Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children and regular class intergration.
Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 393-400.
- Haring, N. G. A study of classroom teachers' attitudes toward exceptional children.
Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 17 103-104.
- Haring, N. G., Stern, G. G. & Cruickshank, W. M.
Attitudes of Educators toward Exceptional Children.
Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1958.
- Larrivee, B. & Cook, L. Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitudes.
The Journal of Special Education 1979, 13(3), 315-324.
- McDaniel, L. Changing vocational teachers' attitudes toward the handicapped.
Exceptional Children, 1982, 48(4), 377-378.
- Meers, G. Inservice programs for preparing special needs personnel.
Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 1977, 14(4), 41-45.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"The Related Vocational Instruction Program."

GVA News, March, 1982, 12.

Taylor, C. & Gill, D. The Related Vocational Instruction Program.

The Journal For Vocational Special Needs Education, 1979, 2(1), 3-7.

Tindall, L. W. Education for all handicapped persons: A mandate for the new year.

American Vocational Journal, 1978, 53(1), 26-29.

2009-2017 TEST TCA 00

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACCESS & EQUITY FOR HANDICAPPED
YOUTH IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

R. Brian Cobb
Assistant Professor-Special Education
University of Maryland
1308 Benjamin Building
College Park, Maryland 20742

L. Allen Phelps
Associate Professor and Director
Office of Career Development for Special Populations
Department of Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820

INTRODUCTION

In 1963, with the enactment of the Vocational Education Act, (VEA), Congress initiated an historic and sustained effort to improve education for employment for our nation's handicapped school-aged population. Those who were responsible for the development of the Act recognized that, upon leaving school, handicapped individuals need to be able to enter the workforce in productive and satisfying employment. Subsequent Amendments to the Act, passed in 1968 and 1976, have continued the initiatives started two decades ago, and have reinforced them with expenditure requirements, commonly called the 10% set-aside. While the states as a whole have had difficulties expending those set-asides, findings from the recent three year evaluation of vocational education nationwide (David, 1981) clearly suggest a continuing need for these types of fiscal requirements:

The idea of reserving federal funds for the purpose of assisting and stimulating the states to provide programs and services to students with special needs is a sound approach to attaining greater equality of opportunity in vocational education. In the absence of such a provision, states and localities would very probably not be devoting even the relatively modest resources they now do to serving the handicapped...(p. xxiii)

This sentiment was echoed repeatedly in testimony offered in recent hearings on the reauthorization of the VEA of 1963. In letters entered into testimony by state special needs coordinators in vocational education there was virtual unanimity that substantial reductions in enrollments and services would occur in their respective states should the 10% set-aside provision be removed (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982, pp.66-88; 133-265; 405-407). Subsequent draft bills to reauthorize the Act (AVA model draft bill; Hatch Bill S 1039) have also recommended maintenance of specific set-asides for handicapped individuals ("Work Begins," 1983). This continuing commitment at multiple levels of government clearly reflects a concern that handicapped youth, upon leaving the educational system, must be prepared for competitive employment and that employers must be prepared to accept them in proportions commensurate with their numbers in the general population. Thus, although a substantial amount of congressional and advocacy support in Washington exists in favor of the special/vocational education legislation, an analysis of historical practices indicates that federal initiatives, regulations, and political maneuvering represent only a portion of the educational service delivery equation (see, for example, House, 1980; Hall & Loucks, 1983). Before high-quality educational opportunities in the least restrictive setting can be delivered to handicapped students, state and local school district personnel must accept the federal mandates and develop programs and services to meet the needs of the students, to be served.

At the time of this research, the spirit of the P.L. 94-142, and P.L. 94-482 legislation, as they pertain to handicapped students, has yet to be fully realized, at least in vocational programming. The reason most likely lies in two troubling and interrelated problems that continue to exist in our society despite these continuing federal initiatives.

The first is that enrollment patterns of handicapped students in regular vocational education programs continues to show: (1) depressed levels of overall enrollment relative to their numbers in the general high school population, (2) consistently high proportions enrolled in low-skill training programs, or those (such as in work study) whose goal is not related to occupation-specific training at all, and (3) consistently high levels of mildly handicapped students whose regular vocational education is occurring without benefit of supportive services (primarily learning disabled) or who are being trained in segregated vocational education or special/vocational education classes (primarily mildly mentally retarded).

The second major pattern relates to persistently depressed levels of employment of handicapped persons who are willing and able, and available to work. A brief summary of each of these problem areas follows.

Enrollment Patterns

Problems in enrollment of handicapped youth in vocational education have been documented for about a decade now. In 1973, the U.S. Department of Education reported handicapped enrollment in vocational education to be 1.9% (cited in Phelps, 1982). Concurrently, Olympus Research Corporation (1973) suggested that of those 1.9% who were enrolled nationwide, (a) nearly 70% were enrolled in segregated programs, and (b) 63% were enrolled in non-skills classes such as prevocational programs.

There is some evidence of a weakening of these patterns in more recent national datasets. The Office of Civil Rights Survey of the Public Schools (OCR, 1980) shows for the 1979-80 school year, enrollment of handicapped students in comprehensive high schools and area vocational centers was 2.94% and 4.96% respectively. Similarly, the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) 1979-80 data place the overall unduplicated handicapped enrollments in secondary vocational education at 3.0% (NCES, 1982). Thus it is apparent that, overall, handicapped students may be making gains in access to vocational education programs, although certainly these data do not show enrollments proportionate to their estimated percentage incidence levels.

Less encouraging, however, are the most recent conclusions concerning the program quality for those who have gained access to vocational education programs. The OCR (1980) data indicated, for example, that more than 56% of the total Custodial Services enrollment in Area Vocational Centers (AVC) were handicapped, as were more than 11% of the Food Services enrollees. Similarly, both comprehensive high schools and AVC's showed substantially elevated enrollments of handicapped persons in Work Study programs. Also, Nacson and Kelly (1980) in their NIE substudy research reported differential treatment of mildly handicapped students, depending upon disability status. These kinds of conclusions were echoed by Beuke, Lukas, Brigham, Glick, and Breen, (1980) in their NIE substudy research, by Wright, Cooperstein, Renneker, and Padilla, (1982, p. 81) in a summary report of three longitudinal studies of the implementation of P.L. 94-142, and in the Fourth Annual Report to Congress on the implementation of P.L. 94-142, (U.S. Department of Education, 1982a, p. 23). Of special concern were the difficulties concerning rural vocational programming (National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project, 1980) and the unavoidable fiscal difficulties associated with appropriately serving secondary handicapped students in vocational training programs (National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 1980).

Employment Patterns

Recently, NCES surveyed the class of 1979 and found that, despite a national unemployment rate of 16.5%, graduates of secondary vocational education programs experienced only a 9.7% unemployment rate. Their conclusion:

Vocational education programs are apparently fulfilling the purpose for which they were intended: training people for jobs. ("Unemployment Rates," 1982, p. 651)

It is also important to note that this positive employment status occurred at a time when secondary vocational enrollment was increasing slightly its percentage of the total secondary enrollment. (U.S. Department of Education, 1982b)

Employment patterns of handicapped individuals have, on the other hand, displayed distressingly high levels of unemployment and underemployment. Bowe, (1978), citing the 1970 Census data reported 42% of those disabled six months or longer were employed, and 63% of those who were employed were at or near the poverty level. Levitan and Taggart (1976), in an often-cited study, placed the employment rate at 40%. And in 1980, Bowe further described those who were employed to indicate that 85% earned less than \$7,000, and 53% earned less than \$2,000.

Preliminary data are now available from the 1980 Census, and from the Current Population Survey studies conducted in 1981 and 1982. Bowe, (1983a) has again analyzed these data, and, as he states in his Executive Summary:

The news is both good and bad. It is heartening to see that full-time workers with disabilities earn about as much as do their nondisabled counterparts. But the fact that few are working spurs us to redouble our efforts to enhance employment of disabled people. (p. 5)

Specifically, the proportion of disabled individuals who were not participating in the labor force and who specified their disability as the reason, rose 39% in the decade between 1970 and 1980—from 40% to 51%. This was primarily because far fewer disabled individuals in 1980 than in 1970 who were employed indicated that their disability limited their workability. Also, unemployment rates for disabled individuals were nearly double that of their non-disabled counterparts. In terms of income levels, slightly more than 70% of disabled individuals who were employed earned less than \$8,000, and 26.6% earned less than \$2,000.

Data concerning employment experiences of mildly handicapped high school graduates are virtually nonexistent. One small study that has appeared (Meyers, Messerer, & Bachman, 1981) suggests that this population experiences higher unemployment rates and suffers from lack of generic job survival and interpersonal skills.

A final employment pattern for handicapped persons is concerned with employer attitudes about hiring handicapped individuals. Employers have long been skeptical about hiring handicapped workers for a variety of reasons, virtually all of which are unfounded in the literature (Mithaug, 1979). Although the literature is relatively thin in this area, most recent evidence (Koestler, 1979; Federal Register, 1978) confirms that handicapped workers perform at their jobs as safely, as consistently, and as productively as their nonhandicapped colleagues.

The foregoing discussion suggests the problem of this study, namely, that little data are available that allow a reliable examination of the relative

extent to which: (a) different handicapped students have access to the full range of vocational education programs, and (b) students who are handicapped and do gain access to vocational education are served in an equitable manner.

OBJECTIVES

In December, 1982, the U.S. Office of Special Education awarded the Office of Career Development for Special Populations (OCDSP) a research contract to examine these access and equity considerations. Its broad purposes were threefold:

- (1) to assess access - the extent to which mildly handicapped youth receive vocationally oriented curricula from a variety of sources;
- (2) to assess equity - the extent to which those students who are the recipients of vocationally oriented curricula receive that curricula in an equitable manner; and
- (3) to assess the extent to which existing data (primarily the IEP) and existing data systems (primarily the VEDS and the FACTS) are reliable indicators of access and equity in vocational education.

For the first broad purpose above, the following questions organized the research effort:

- (1) By what different programs (vocational education or special education) do EMI, LD, BD, and EH students receive vocationally oriented curricula?
- (2) How does the existence of vocationally-related annual goals on the IEP differ for students with different categorical labels, different sexes, and different races?
- (3) How do the variables of categorical disability, sex, and ethnicity affect access to these different programs?
- (4) How does access to vocational education/industrial arts curricula differ for mildly handicapped students versus nonhandicapped students?
- (5) How is access to vocational education/industrial arts curricula affected by the size of high school enrollments, and the district's per pupil expenditures?

For the equity purpose of the study, (purpose #2 above), the following questions were specified:

- (1) What relationships exist between the categorical disability of students who have access to vocational programs and the restrictiveness of educational placement?
- (2) What relationship exists between access to vocational education and the existence of vocational assessment information of the IEP?
- (3) What relationships exist between the type of vocational assessment information of the IEP and such variables as categorical disability, sex, and ethnicity.
- (4) What is the nature and scope of vocationally oriented curricula (including vocational education and annual goals on the IEP), to which handicapped students are given access?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For purpose #3, the use of existing data and data systems, the following questions were analyzed:

- (1) How valid an indicator of vocational education/industrial arts access is the "VE as a related service" listing on the Illinois child-count system (Funding and Child Tracking System, FACTS)?
- (2) What relationship exists between placement setting in vocational education and the LRE code on the FACTS?
- (3) How well do the FACTS and VEDS (Vocational Education Data System) interface in their ability to measure access to vocational education curricula?

PROCEDURES

The 1981-82 child-counts from a random sample of 98 secondary school districts in Illinois were reviewed. All handicapped students in the categories of educably mentally handicapped, learning disabled, educationally handicapped, and behaviorally disordered were included in the study, resulting in a sampling frame of 3,098 students. Data on these students were then collected along the variables of disability, ethnicity, sex, restrictiveness of educational environment, school size, school wealth, and whether or not vocational education was listed as a related service for the student.

Finally, a random sample of 377 students was selected for further study. The 1981-82 IEPs and course enrollments (schedules) of these students were reviewed on-site, and data were collected identifying the extent to which these students were involved in vocational and industrial arts education coursework, and had vocationally-related information on their IEPs. Ultimately, complete information was collected on 293 of these students, representing 40 school districts. For more complete information on the procedures used in this study the reader may obtain copies of the final report from the OCDSP at the University of Illinois. Additionally, a manual has been developed that outlines procedures in which local administrators may engage to assess and equity considerations in their own school districts. That manual is also available.

RESULTS

To begin with, a broad perception about the state-of-the-art of vocational/special education, at least in Illinois, can be stated. In general, vocational/special education appears widely accepted, supported, and pervasive. Informal conversations with special education administrators and teachers during all phases of this study have supported a widely-held belief in its merit. Indeed, many have also indicated that a study of the 1981-82 school year underestimates its present status. They were almost universally supportive of this exploratory research, and seemed to anticipate unequivocally positive results. During the on-site IEP analyses, some of the more current IEPs that were informally observed in the student's cumulative folders seemed to support these beliefs. Many of the current IEP forms include subheads in the present levels of educational performance section that were specifically reserved for vocational/prevocational information. Given the relative nascency of vocational/special education, and indeed secondary special education generally, this represents a remarkable improvement for employment training for handicapped students, given the kinds of options that existed nearly a decade ago.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Access

Access to vocational education has been defined in several different ways in this study. Depending upon which measure is employed, a variety of conclusions can be reached about relative access to vocational education for mildly handicapped high school students. First, however, some indicator of nonhandicapped access to vocational education must be acknowledged for comparative purposes. Reviewing the VEDS enrollments of the 40 school districts participating in this study, about 74% of their secondary students received vocational education in 1981-82. Reliability difficulties with these estimates notwithstanding, this figure will be used as a benchmark against which to measure equality of access for handicapped students.

Probably the strictest but most comparable definition of access would entail using one in which only those handicapped students enrolled in qualified vocational education courses would be considered to have access. Under this definition, 67.9% of the 293 students in the sample were enrolled in vocational education/industrial arts coursework, representing only slightly less involvement than the nonhandicapped enrollment. By adding any of the other measures of access that were examined in this study (VE as a related service, vocationally-related annual goals, or vocationally oriented special education programs), the proportion would exceed that of the nonhandicapped population.

A more popular technique to measure access has been to cite the overall percentage of handicapped students who are reported to be enrolled in vocational education. Benson and Hoachlander's (1981) recent NIE research have placed those enrollments at 3.3% suggesting underenrollment nationwide. The primary data base for those reports, however, has been the VEDS, and it is particularly unreliable in terms of handicapped enrollment. In Illinois, for example, an informal interview with a staff person with the Civil Rights section of the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education (DAVTE) indicated that neither the VEDS, the FACTS, nor the school district claim forms seemed to be able to reliably project frequencies of enrollments in vocational education of different subgroups of handicapped students. She also indicated, concurrent with this research, that typically their on-site evaluations of school districts found that access to vocational education was not a major issue of concern, but equity was. The conclusion that must be rendered here is that, based upon this research and under broad definitions of vocational education participation, access to vocational education may no longer be an issue for mildly handicapped high school students. Regardless of definitional problems, it seems evident that many more mildly handicapped students get access to some form of training for employment than are projected in the major national data bases.

A second access issue addressed in this study was the treatment across disability group, ethnicity, and sex. The Illinois VEDS data indicated that, as far as sex was concerned, boys were given greater access to vocational education in the sampled districts by a ratio of 1.07 to 1.0. That inequity seemed to maintain with handicapped students as well after controlling for initial disparities. At issue here, then, was not inequitable access for handicapped versus nonhandicapped students, but inequities for all boys versus all girls.

With students of different ethnicity, from the 40 school districts sampled in this study, white nonhandicapped students were nearly one and one half times as likely to receive vocational education as nonwhites. This trend was reversed, however, with handicapped students, but disability may have been a mediating factor in that reversal. Unfortunately, the numbers in this study

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

were simply not large enough to ascertain true trends. Finally, one's disability category, in and of itself, did not appear to overly constrain or augment access. Again, using enrollment in an established vocational education course as a measure of access, EMI students were slightly underenrolled, relative to their numbers in the sample, and BD students were substantially overenrolled. LD and EH students were enrolled in proportions virtually identical to their numbers in the sample.

Equity

Much criticism has been leveled at vocational education for its relatively inequitable treatment within. The work of Berryman (1982), Weisberg (1983), McClure (1979), and Hamilton (1979) suggest that racial and sex biases continue to persist in terms of minorities and girls being channeled into vocational education coursework that prepares its graduates for lower-paying employment. The Council for Exceptional Children, in its analysis of the OCR (1980) survey, (CEC Submits Testimony, 1982), charged similar discriminatory practices with handicapped students.

For the students examined in this study, disability status may indeed affect the quality of the vocational course placement. At the risk of oversimplifying, children labeled EMI did appear to get somewhat less equitable treatment than those in any of the other three categories in this study. Also, although the data were not tabled, a sizeable majority of the female enrollment across all disability groups was relegated to the CWT, Business Education, (primarily Typing), and Home Economics curricula. Again, nonwhite data were simply too limited to draw definitive conclusions.

A second issue of internal access that did appear in the study is concerned with services, once in vocational education. If, as Grubb (1978), and many others have maintained, a major purpose of vocational education is to provide relevant curricula for the 50% - 60% of the student body for whom college preparatory and general curricula are not particularly well-suited, then handicapped students would clearly fall into this category, and adequate services ought to be available to make those placements as successful as possible. While placements seemed to be there, the services did not. First, only about one third of the 199 sampled students who were enrolled in a vocational education course had "VE as a related service" specified for them on the FACTS child-count, and less than 40% of them had vocationally-related annual goals on their IEPs. This may be somewhat of an underestimation, since in some cases, no annual goals reflecting vocational content existed, but anecdotal information attached to the IEP indicated that assistance was going to be provided. In most cases, however, those particular students had a "VE" listed as a related service on the FACTS.

This form of inequity was triangulated through two other data sources, although both were not built into the research design per se. First, the Civil Rights staff person who was informally interviewed indicated that the comprehensiveness of services to handicapped students who were enrolled in vocational education courses was a problem statewide; she reiterated that overall access was not. Also, in reviewing transcripts for vocational coursework of handicapped students, this researcher observed a high number of "D" and "F" grades, and dropped courses. It appears, then, that placements in vocational education were being made in equitable proportions, but services to make those placements successful (and appropriate) were not.

A portion of this study was devoted to an examination of the "referral → identification → assessment → placement" paradigm that has been adopted in the literature for use in vocational/special education. The point of interest

in this study was not to ascertain whether or not the components existed, but to assess the implied directionality of the "assessment→placement" part of the paradigm. In prior research on the topic, Nacson and Kelly (1980) suggested that placement in vocational education was seldom viewed to have been made as a result of assessed vocational interests and competencies. In fact, they stated:

The academic-related identification and assessment procedures used by most school districts tended to limit the vocational options available to special needs students. In most instances, placement appeared to be contingent on performance in basic competency areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Students who failed to achieve a level of acceptable competency in these basic skills were placed in compensatory or remedial programs. Such placement usually reduced the likelihood of participation by subgroups of special needs students in regular vocational education programs. (emphasis added, p. xiii)

The findings of this study support, in large measure, those statements above. The breakdown in service delivery appeared to rest in the lack of reliable and available vocational assessments that preceded placement, and that were related to curricula. Much of the assessment information specified on the IEPs, for example, was prior grades in vocational courses, most of which appeared to have little to do with 1981-82 course enrollments. Several school personnel indicated that they would have liked to have had in their districts the opportunity for comprehensive vocational evaluations, but interestingly, in those districts that did, rarely was the information incorporated into the IEP, nor did it appear to have substantially influenced vocational enrollment patterns. Typically, vocational evaluation reports were placed in cumulative folders, and appeared little-used, at least in terms of IEP annual goal specification, present levels of performance, or classroom placements.

Least restrictive placement in vocational education is, of course, inextricably involved with vocational assessment. What makes it even more complex, however, is that, with vocational education, many special educators have come to believe that the least restrictive environment for handicapped youth may no longer be the regular classroom, but community work-placement settings. In this study, for example, the single most widespread course option, cutting across all disability groups, was the CWT program. This was kind of a prevocational cooperative education program, typically associated with disadvantaged and handicapped students. Its function was, ostensibly, to introduce handicapped students to the world of work, and to determine work-related behavioral deficits. No school districts in this study, however, appeared to overtly incorporate CWT course achievement information into the IEP development process.

With existing data available in this study, assessing LRE equity for mildly handicapped students with different status characteristics was extremely difficult. The FACTS LRE code was not a function of vocational education placement, nor did course enrollment information allow for any distinctions beyond the mainstreamed/segregated dichotomy. The findings of Nacson and Kelly (1980), Beuke et al. (1980), Wright et al. (1981), and Wright et al. (1980), again, were supported in this study, in terms of differential treatment for students considered mentally retarded, versus the other three categories. Enrollment of EMI students in regular or mainstreamed courses was somewhat below their proportions in the sample.

As a whole, however, mildly "judgmentally" handicapped students appeared to have more access to regular vocational education coursework than these studies have portrayed. Whether or not Illinois was representative of the nation as a whole is not known.

Summary

This study was conceptually and methodologically predicated upon three major premises. The first was that individuals in any of the mildly handicapping conditions examined in this study should receive equal treatment in terms of access, assessment, and least restrictive programming, and that deviations from that "statistical independence" were important and should be reported. The second was that the "assessment→placement" paradigm was operationally in effect in Illinois schools to the extent necessary enough to explain deviations from the first premise. The last premise was that the FACTS was a reliable enough data source to measure the paradigm. None of these premises proved true.

In terms of the first premise, individuals in the EMI group may be more homogeneous in their educationally relevant deficits than are students in any of the other categories. In a sense, then, the findings from this study of differential treatment for children labeled EMI versus all other categorical disabilities may be logical and, in fact, unimportant. Nonetheless, the lack of placement in vocational education based upon vocational assessment information still suggests treatment by label, rather than treatment by educationally relevant deficits, and makes this a potentially valuable contribution to the literature in the field. Although vocationally oriented, this study again bears witness to the pernicious effects of labeling upon educational treatment of children.

It should not have been surprising that treatment by label was found in this study, given the inadequacy of the "assessment→placement" paradigm as an explanation of how placements were made in vocational/special education programs. If vocational assessment data cannot be used to accurately predict vocational placement, special educators have little alternative other than to make placements based upon non-vocational assessment data. The need for models of functional, curriculum-referenced vocational assessment appeared repeatedly in this research. Until these are available to special educators, the inversion of the "assessment→placement" to the placement→assessment" sequence will probably continue.

The lack of construct validity of the "VE" and LRE" codes on the FACTS, at least as they pertained to vocational education access and placement issues, proved to be the most disappointing and debilitating aspect of this study. Doubtless, intra-district validity existed, but the use of the FACTS across districts, except to define the initial sampling frame, proved problematic. Some of the recommendations made above should address these validity problems. Until the FACTS becomes more valid, however, longitudinal, intra-district studies, rather than cross-sectional inter-district studies such as this one should probably be conducted.

REFERENCES

- Benson, C.S. & Hoachlander, E.G. (May 1981). An analysis of the distribution of funds for vocational education: A survey of ten states (Prepared under NIE Contract No. 400-78-0038, Substudy A). Berkeley: Project on National Vocational Education, University of California.
- Berryman, S.E. (1982). The equity and effectiveness of secondary vocational education. In H. F. Silberman, (Ed.), Education and work (The Eighty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beuke, V.L., Lukas, C.V., Brigham, N., Glick, G.S., & Breen, J.P. (December 1980). Implementation of the Education Amendments of 1976: A study of state and local compliance and evaluation practices (Final Report, AAI Report No. 80-113). Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Bowe, F. (1978). Handicapping America: Barriers to disabled people. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowe, F. (1980). Rehabilitating America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowe, F. (August 1983). Disabled adults in America: A statistical portrait drawn from Census Bureau data (Final Draft version,). Washington, D.C.: President's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped.
- CEC submits testimony for vocational reauthorization. CEC Update (1982), 14 (1), 4.
- David, H. (September 1981). The vocational education study: The final report (Publication No. 8). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Federal Register. Position statement on comprehensive vocational education for handicapped persons. September 25, 1978, p. 186.
- Grubb, W.N. (April 1979). The phoenix of vocational education: Implications for evaluation. In H. David and G. Hendrickson (Eds.), The planning papers for the vocational education study (Vocational Education Study Publication Study No. 1). Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education.
- Hall, G.E., & Loucks, S.F. (1982). Bridging the gap: Policy research footed in practice. In A. Lieberman & M.W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Policy-making in education (Eighty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hamilton, P. (April 1979). Vocational education for special-need students. In H. David and G. Hendrickson (Eds.), The planning papers for the vocational education study (Vocational Education Study Publication No. 1). Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education.
- House, E.R. (1980). Transferability and equity in innovation policy. In L. Rubin (Ed.), Critical issues of educational policy: An administrator's overview. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Koestler, F. (1978). Jobs for handicapped persons: A new era in civil rights. New York: Public Affairs Committee.
- Levitan, S.A., & Taggart, R. (1976). Jobs for the disabled. Washington, D.C.: Center for Manpower Policy Studies, George Washington University.
- McClure, P. (April 1979). Race and sex compliance issues in vocational education. In H. David and G. Hendrickson (Eds.), The planning papers for the vocational education study (Vocational Education Study Publication No. 1). Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education.
- Meyers, G., Messerer, J., & Bachman, L. (November 1981). What becomes of learning disabled and behavior disordered adolescents after they leave school? Counterpoint.
- Mithaug, D.E. (1979). Negative employer attitudes toward hiring the handicapped: Fact or fiction? Journal of Contemporary Business, 8 (4), 19-26.
- Nacson, J., & Kelly, E.M. (Winter 1980). Vocational education: Meeting the needs of special populations - Executive summary (prepared under contract for the National Institute of Education - ALNA #145). Washington, D.C.: A.L. Nellum Associates.
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Report on the implementation of the provisions of P.L. 94-142. Unpublished Report, 1980.
- National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project (1980). A national comparative study regarding rural special education delivery systems before and after passage of P.L. 94-142. Murray, KY: Center for Innovation and Development, Murray State University.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (April 1982). Vocational Education Data System (Preliminary Data Tables). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Office of Civil Rights. (August 1980). Fall 1979 vocational education survey (unedited data). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Olympus Research Corporation (October 1974). An assessment of vocational education programs for the handicapped under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act (Final Report). Salt Lake City: Author.
- Phelps, L.A. (May 1982). Hearings on the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Prepared Statement before the Joint Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, and the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Unemployment rates lower for vocational education graduates: NCES (1982). Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (10), p. 651.

U.S. Department of Education (1982). "To assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children" (Fourth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (a)

U.S. Department of Education (December 1982). Vocational enrollment remains steady (Preliminary Vocational Education Data System data). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics. (b)

U.S. Government Printing Office (May 1982). Hearings on the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Joint Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, and the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Weisberg, A. (1983). What research has to say about vocational education and the high schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (5), 355-359.

Work begins on reauthorization bill. Update, September/October 1983, p. 6

Wright, A.R., Cooperstein, R.A., Renneker, E.G., & Padilla, C. (December 1982). Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: Final report of a longitudinal study (SRI Project 7124). Menlo Park, CA: Social Sciences Center, SRI International.

Wright, A.R., Padilla, C., & Cooperstein, R.A. (1981). Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: Third year report of a longitudinal study (SRI Project 7124) Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, Educational and Human Services Center.

Wright, A.R., Padilla, C., Renneker, E.G., & Stearns, M.S. (1980). Local implementation of P.L. 94-142: Second year report of a longitudinal study (SRI Project 7124). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, Education Research Center.

THE INVOLVEMENT OF
HANDICAPPED STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SPECIAL EDUCATORS
IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Leonard Albright
Visiting Associate Professor
Departments of Vocational and Special Education
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

James Frasier
Coordinator of Secondary Cooperative Education
Programs and Adult Services
Hartford Area Vocational Center
White River Jct., Vermont

Prepared for Presentation at the
First Annual Vocational Special Needs Research Meeting
American Vocational Association Convention
Anaheim, California

December, 1983

THE INVOLVEMENT OF HANDICAPPED
STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SPECIAL EDUCATORS
IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION^{1,2}

INTRODUCTION

The relatively recent emphasis on providing appropriate vocational education to students with handicapping conditions has spawned several investigations of vocational educator involvement in the individualized education program (IEP) process (Fair, 1980; Smith and Von Hippel, 1980; Albright and Hux, 1981; Albright and Preskill, 1982). While these studies have consistently found that vocational teachers are seldom present at IEP meetings, Albright and Preskill (1982) did note that many vocational teachers were indirect contributors to the IEP process, via one-to-one communications with special education personnel.

An assessment of vocational educator involvement in the IEP process represents one important way of looking at the relationship between vocational education and the IEP. However, since the IEP process is to involve parents, students, and educators, an examination of their connection with vocational education during the IEP process could provide a more thorough understanding of the current relationship between the vocational education delivery system and the IEP effort. Unfortunately, empirical studies of this nature are noticeably absent in the vocational and special education literature.

OBJECTIVES

Since little was known about the nature and extent of IEP student, parent, and special educator involvement in vocational education generally, and in Vermont specifically, a primary objective of this study was to obtain a reading on the present state of affairs in this area. Therefore, the central question guiding this exploratory investigation was:

To what extent are the handicapped students enrolled in vocational programs at the area centers, their parents and their special educators involved in the development, delivery and review of vocational education as part of the IEP process?

1

This study, which was conducted during the second half of the 1981-82 school year, was made possible through a grant from the Vermont Advisory Council for Vocational Education. Additional support was provided through the "Careers" training project at the University of Vermont, the Vermont Division of Vocational-Technical Education and the Leadership Training Institute in Vocational/Special Education at the University of Illinois.

2

Len Albright was the director of this project. James Frasier served as project coordinator while on sabbatical leave from his school district to pursue advanced graduate study in vocational/special education at the University of Vermont.

A secondary objective was to examine if differences in IEP student, parent and special educator involvement in vocational education existed in terms of; (1) parent socio-economic status (SES), (2) student home school location, and (3) student need for an IEP.

METHOD

Sample Groups

Ten percent (10%) of all handicapped students enrolled in regular secondary vocational education programs at Vermont's 16 area vocational centers were randomly selected for this study. To be considered for selection, the students had to be enrolled in a regular vocational program for at least one class period per day for a minimum of one semester. Of the 555 handicapped vocational education students reported by area center guidance coordinators, 55 were initially selected for the student sample.

Once the student sample had been identified, the parent(s) of each student and the special educator responsible for managing the student's IEP were automatically considered for inclusion in the study.

Data Collection Procedures/Instrumentation

After receiving the necessary clearances from school districts and parents, telephone and personal interviews were used to collect data for this study. Parents participated in a telephone survey, while students and special educators took part in personal interviews. If, as in 3 cases, the parents did not have a telephone, then personal interviews were conducted. Likewise, if arrangements for a personal interview with a student or special educator could not be made, then a telephone interview took place. This occurred in 2 cases.

Although separate interview instruments were developed for the student, parent and special educator groups, similar questions were asked of each group. The questions essentially sought information on involvement during; 1) development of student's vocational program, as part of individualized planning; 2) implementation of student's vocational program; and 3) review of student's overall progress, which was to occur near end of school year. This three-stage view of involvement was taken from an earlier study of vocational educator participation in the IEP process (Albright and Preskill, 1982).

Initial drafts of the instruments were reviewed for content appropriateness, clarity and comprehensiveness by a committee of 6 representatives from the Vermont Advisory Council for Vocational Education. In addition, the parent interview guide was pilot-tested with three parents. The student and special educator instruments were formatively evaluated during the first several interviews.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Data Analysis

Descriptive data received from parent, student and special educator interviews were coded and tabulated in frequencies and percentages. In addition, Chi-square testing was used to examine whether each respondent group's involvement in the vocational component of the IEP differed in terms of three variables: 1) parent SES; 2) student home school location; and 3) student need for an IEP. Since the study was exploratory in purpose and designed to provide baseline information for subsequent inquiry, a $p < .10$ significance level was selected.

RESULTS

A total of 124 parents, students and special educators participated in the study: 49 parents, 44 students and 31 special educators.⁴ The results from the respondent groups are reported under two sections; 1) demographic information and 2) involvement in vocational education component.

Demographic Information

This section provides information about the composition of each respondent group. Also presented are results from examining the relationship between selected demographic variables (ie. parent SES, student need for an IEP and student home school location) and indicators of involvement in individualized vocational programming.

Parents

Of the parents interviewed, 86% were women. About 10% of the parents indicated belonging to a parent-teacher organization or to a parent advocacy group.

An estimate of parent SES was obtained through use of an occupation scale (Research for Better Schools, 1974). Sixteen or 33% of the 49 parents were classified as high SES; 21 or 45% of the parents were middle SES; and 11 parents or 22% fell within the low SES category.

Chi-square testing of the relationship between parent SES and involvement of the three respondent groups in individualized vocational programming (i.e. involvement in the development, the delivery and the review of the child's vocational education component) produced no significant differences.

Students

Eighty percent (80%) of the students interviewed were male. A majority of the student sample (68%) was in the 17 - 18 age range.

4

The smaller sample size of special educators was due to the fact that several IEP case managers were responsible for more than one student in the sample.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In terms of home school location, 25 or 57% of the students attended high schools attached to the area vocational centers (i.e. host schools). The remaining 43% of the student sample were from sending schools.

Significant differences were found in the relationship between location of student's home high school and involvement in individualized vocational programming. The direction and statistical strength of these differences are described in the second section (Involvement in Vocational Education Component).

Special Educators

Nearly 80% of the 31 special educators interviewed possessed at least a master's degree in education. Roughly 95% of the teachers fell within the range of 1 to 5 years experience in their respective school districts.

Vermont was a non-categorical state at the time of this investigation; that is, the State's student eligibility standards for special education services were not based on specific categories of handicapping conditions. Yet, when the investigators asked the special educators to describe each student's need for an IEP, their responses fell in one of five categorical areas. These are shown on Table 1.

Table 1

Student Need for an IEP as Reported By Special Education Personnel		
Categorical Area	f	%
50% Deficit	21	46
Learning Disabled	11	24
Mentally Retarded	10	22
Health Impaired	2	4
Emotionally Disturbed	2	4
	46	100

Note: When the study was in progress, the term, "50% deficit" was a generic phrase used in Vermont to describe students in need of special education services. During the following school year, however, the Vermont Division of Special Education adopted the use of conventional categories of handicapping conditions for eligibility and reporting purposes and the 50% deficit term was abandoned.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chi-square testing of the relationship between student need for an IEP (in terms of the five categorical areas) and involvement of the three respondent groups in individualized vocational programming produced no significant differences.

Involvement in Vocational Education Component

The reporting of results from parent, student and special educator groups is organized according to each of the three stages of the IEP process. Each stage includes a description of the information sought, followed by a narrative summary and graphic presentation of the data.

Development

The questions in this stage sought information on procedures used in planning for the student's entry into vocational education and the respondent's role in this effort. The three major indicators or questions posed were:

- 1) How was it determined that the student would take a vocational course?
- 2) Did you meet with others to talk about and plan for the student's participation in the vocational education course? if yes, with whom?
- 3) Did the student have a written plan for her/his vocational education course?

Nearly all individuals surveyed said that the determination about whether the pupil would take a vocational course was made at the student's home school, usually in conjunction with special education and/or guidance personnel. No respondent mentioned the involvement of area vocational center personnel in such deliberations.

As shown in Table 2, more than half of each respondent group mentioned that a meeting had been held to talk about and plan for the pupil's participation in a vocational education course. Virtually all of these respondents also said that they had attended the planning meeting and that it had occurred prior to the student's actual participation in a vocational course. The persons most often mentioned as being present included various combinations of parents, special educator and student, with frequent reference to the participation of guidance personnel. The involvement of vocational personnel was cited by nine special educators, seven students and two parents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Involvement in Development of
Vocational Education Component

Indicator	Respondent Group					
	Parents (N = 49)		Students (N = 43)		Special Educators (N = 46)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Reported meeting with school personnel to talk about and plan for pupil's participation in vocational education course.	34	69%	22	51%	34	74%
2. Expressed knowledge of a written plan for student's participation in vocational education course.	14	29%	4	9%	22	48%

Note: The N = 46 in the special education column represents special educator response by individual students in sample.

In terms of examining the student home-school location variable with involvement in planning, two differences were noted. First, a higher proportion of sending school students reported participation in planning sessions than did their peers from host schools ($p < .02$). Secondly, as reported by the 22 involved students, the participation rate of guidance personnel from sending schools was substantially higher than from host schools ($p < .01$).

Also displayed in Table 2 are respondent group responses to knowledge of a written plan for student participation in vocational education. While the special education group reported that such plans existed for about half of the student sample, several of these teachers were quick to note that these plans were of a more general nature and were included as part of the student's IEP. Moreover, sending school special educators acknowledged the presence of a written vocational plan more frequently than host school special educators ($p < .04$).

Implementation

The questions/indicators used in this stage examined the extent of involvement of the respondent during the student's participation in a vocational education course. More specifically, the major questions asked were:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- 1) Do you know if the student is receiving special help in order to succeed in vocational education? If so, what type of special help? Was this help part of the original plan for the student?
- 2) Have you discussed student's progress in vocational education with school personnel? If so, with whom, and how frequent?

As seen in Table 3, 19 or 39% of the parents were aware of special vocationally-oriented services being provided to their children. Eighteen of the 19 parents felt that these services were necessary and nearly 70% of this group said these services were part of the original plan for the student. The most common type of service mentioned was remedial instruction in reading and/or math.

In analyzing the responses of students and special educators by home high school location, two discrepancies were uncovered. First, special vocationally-oriented services were indicated for a larger percentage of sending school students than for host school students (student $p < .06$; special educator $p < .01$). Second, when the parents were asked about contact with school personnel to discuss student progress in vocational education, a higher percentage of contact was reported by parents from host high schools than from parents at the sending schools ($p < .02$).

Table 3
Involvement During Implementation
Of Student's Vocational Course

Indicator	Respondent Group								
	Parents (N = 49)			Students (N = 44)			Special Educators (N = 46)		
	Yes	No	Un- Certain	Yes	No	Un- Certain	Yes	No	Un- Certain
1. Expressed knowledge of pupil receiving special services.	19	27							
2. Indicated that special services were being provided in order to help student in vocational setting.				21	23		21	17	8
3. Reported contact with personnel to discuss student's progress in vocational setting.	27	22		24	20		41		5

Note: The N = 46 in the special educator column represents special educator response by individual students in sample.

Review

The questions posed under this stage were designed to gather information about end-of-year involvement in reviewing student's performance in vocational education and in planning for subsequent year(s). The central questions assessed respondent knowledge of scheduled review activity and the personnel expected to be involved in this review.

Sixty-three percent (63%) of the special educators, 51% of the parents and 36% of the students indicated that an end-of-the-year review session had been scheduled. Responses from both student and special educator groups revealed that review meetings were more likely to be scheduled for sending school students than for students from host schools (student $p < .04$; special educators $p < .05$).

In terms of identifying the personnel expected to participate in review sessions, the three groups indicated, in order of highest frequency; 1) special education personnel, 2) parents, 3) vocational personnel, 4) guidance personnel and 5) students. While nearly all of the special educators and about 60% of the parents thought vocational educators should be involved in these sessions, many doubted that this would occur.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are framed in terms of the major question explored in this study.

To what extent are the handicapped students enrolled in vocational programs at the area centers, their parents and their special educators involved in the development, delivery and review of vocational education as part of the IEP process?

Although roughly 70% of the parents and 50% of the students reported meeting with school personnel to discuss and plan the pupil's program, it appeared that they were leaving these sessions with limited information about the vocational education component. The findings that only a few parents had contact with vocational education personnel prior to the student's participation in the vocational course; that 2/3 of the parents and 90% of the students were unaware of written plans for the vocational education component; and that 3/5 of the parents did not know if special services were being provided to help their children succeed in vocational settings, strongly suggested that the vocational component of the child's educational program was not an important focal point in these parent-student-educator meetings. This observation is rather discouraging, especially since the vocational education component represents a substantial portion of the child's total education program and that, in recent years, the goal of expanding and improving vocational education opportunities for handicapped students has enjoyed widespread endorsement at national, state and local levels.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While parent SES and student need for IEP variables did not surface as influential factors when looking at the involvement question, the geographical location of the student's home school did emerge as an prominent variable. Students, parents and special educators from sending schools indicated more involvement in developing and reviewing vocational plans than their cohorts from the host high schools. However, when it came to discussing the students's progress as she/he moved through the vocational course, parents from host schools had more contact with special and vocational education personnel than did sending school parents.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While the vocational education component was an integral part of the IEP process for some parents, students and special educators, it was not for the majority of the three respondent groups. Program improvement incentives and research and development initiatives that focus on examining and strengthening the connection between the vocational education delivery system and the IEP process would appear to be both timely and necessary.

When IEP students and parents sought information about vocational education, they were more likely to consult a special educator or a guidance counselor than a vocational educator. This tendency was especially so for parents and students from sending school districts. A case could conceivably be made for area vocational center personnel to pursue a more active and direct role in informing IEP students and parents about vocational education. Yet, this approach tends to ignore the reality that when the time comes to plan an educational program for the handicapped student, the home school special educator and the guidance counselor are the contact persons. Therefore, area vocational center personnel should direct their efforts toward establishing an ongoing program of information sharing about vocational education programs, policies and practices expressly for guidance and special education personnel from all participating school districts. These guidance and special education personnel could, in turn, transmit this information directly to parents and students in individual IEP meetings and through targeted group activities such as vocational education awareness/orientation programs for parents and/or students in the district.

The importance of and need for vocational educator presence in IEP deliberations was mentioned by many parents, students and special educators. While geographical distance, conflicting professional priorities and organizational differences were readily acknowledged by many respondents as being inhibitors to vocational educator participation, creative strategies for addressing this concern should be encouraged and explored.

REFERENCES

- Albright, L. & Hux, T. Concerns of educators and parents in developing IEP's for handicapped students in vocational education. Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 1981 3-(2), 15-20.
- Albright, L. & Preskill, H. Vocational educator involvement in individualized programming for handicapped students. Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1982 7 (3), 11-25.
- Fair, G. Vocational education programming for special education students in Texas - 1980 (final report). Austin: Department of Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency, 1980.
- Research for Better Schools, Inc. Occupation scale: Student demographic Data. Form SDQ-1 (Mimeo). Author: Philadelphia, PA. 1974.
- Smith, E.G. & Von Hippel, C.S. The use of individualized education programs in the provision of vocational education to handicapped students: An assessment of exemplary procedures and practices in secondary, post-secondary and adult vocational programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA., April, 1980.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vocational/Special Education Certification: An Analysis of State Policies and Practices

Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 10

James P. Greenan

Research and Development Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Dave Larkin

Research Assistant
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

A Publication of the
**LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/
VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Office of Career Development
for Special Populations
College of Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

May 1982

Foreword

In the mid 1970s, the passage of Public Laws 94-142 (The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975) and 94-482 (The Education Amendments of 1976 - Title II: Vocational Education) created major changes in vocational education and special education. The developers of the legislation clearly recognized the need for the training and retraining of professionals in bringing about these changes. The extent to which Public Laws 94-142 and 94-482 are fully implemented continues to depend heavily upon the knowledge, expertise, and competencies of teachers, administrators and supervisors, related services personnel, counselors, and others. Assuring that a free and appropriate public education is available to all handicapped persons is contingent upon the development of effective policies for the training and certification of professionals responsible for implementing the laws.

One of the major provisions of Public Law 94-142 was the requirement for local and state education agencies to develop a comprehensive system for personnel development (CSPD) as part of their annual plans for education of the handicapped. The CSPD is essentially a state planning document which includes a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of comprehensive personnel development. The CSPD may also include certification policies, procedures, and practices.

The need for comprehensive vocational education services for all handicapped individuals and appropriately certified personnel has also been acknowledged as an integral part of special education and Public Law 94-142 (Federal Register, September 25, 1978). Further, it has

been noted that special educators generally lack expertise in preparing their students for vocational and career-oriented objectives. Conversely, vocational educators generally lack expertise in dealing with the unique learning and behavioral problems of handicapped adolescents (Clark & Evans, 1977). In many states, progress has been made in bringing these two groups of professionals together in practice as well as in training programs.

In September of 1981, the staff of the Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education considered the prospect of examining the certification policies and practices of the states regarding the combined field of vocational/special education. Following the development of a prospectus for the study and several positive responses from State Education Agency personnel and teacher educators, the study was initiated. This report provides a comprehensive analysis of certification policies and practices. Significant recommendations are made for reviewing and improving the focus upon vocational/special education certification at the state level.

The LTI is indebted to Dr. James P. Greenan and Dave Larkin for designing and conducting the study. The reviewers provided numerous helpful and insightful comments and recommendations during the planning and instrument development stages and review of the draft report. The reviewers included:

Dr. Elaine Beason
Special Education Program
Fort Hays State University

Mr. Hal Birkland, Supervisor
Programs for the Handicapped
Vocational-Technical Division
Minnesota State Department
of Education

Dr. Carl T. Cameron
Departments of Special Education
and Practical Arts and
Vocational-Technical Education
University of Missouri

Ms. Charlotte Conaway
Education Program Specialist
for the Handicapped
Division of State Vocational
Programs
U. S. Department of Education

Dr. Robert A. Henderson,
Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Illinois

Dr. Jack J. Kaufman
Vocational Special Needs
College of Education
University of Idaho

Dr. David Kingsbury
Center for Vocational Education
Bemidji State University

Mr. Robert J. LaCasse, Supervisor
Occupational Education Instruction
for the Handicapped
New York State Department of
Education

Dr. Gary Meers
Division of Special Vocational
Needs Teacher Education
University of Nebraska

Dr. Dennis G. Tesolowski
Division of Vocational Education
Florida International University

Mr. Robert Watson
Special Needs Consultant
Vocational Education for Disadvan-
taged and Handicapped Programs
Vermont State Department of
Education

Mr. Barry Weiss, Manager
Certification
Illinois State Board of Education

The LTI Staff is also extremely grateful to Ms. Shirley Burton for her effort in typing the report. Dr. Janet Treichel was instrumental in the production and dissemination of this report.

L. Allen Phelps, Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Nature of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Objectives and Research Questions	5
Significance of the Study	7
RESEARCH PROCEDURES	9
Instrumentation	9
Population	10
Data Collection	10
Data Analysis	11
FINDINGS	13
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	29
Summary	29
Conclusions	32
Recommendations	34
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX	43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Nature of the Problem

The field of education has recently begun to focus more attention on providing special needs learners with appropriately designed instructional programs and support services. This focus has been particularly evident in vocational education and special education. Existing federal educational legislation (Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975; Public Law 94-482, The Education Amendments of 1976--Title II: Vocational Education) have required that special needs learners receive individualized education programs (IEP), be placed in least restrictive learning environments, and provided with the support services and supplementary aids necessary for them to succeed in regular vocational programs. To accomplish these goals, vocational education and special education personnel will continue to require adequate preparation that will enable them to develop the skills and positive attitudes necessary for working with special needs learners.

However, personnel preparation continues to be an important problem confronting vocational and special education (Rude, 1978; Schofer & Duncan, 1978; Phelps & Thornton, 1979; Howard, 1979; Greenan & Phelps, 1980; Greenan, Cobb, & Batchelor, 1981). In addition, the current legislation suggests little with respect to certification (the process of personnel licensure) of vocational and special education personnel. Further certification has been traditionally an area of the states' concern, although professional associations such as the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) have provided some national direction. However, states generally have had minimal guidelines for

developing policy in terms of how to develop, implement, and evaluate criteria and procedures by which personnel obtain certification.

There is some evidence which suggests that vocational education and special education personnel in the states are increasingly receiving training relative to the education of special needs learners. Brock (1979) cited an increase in the number of states requiring special education training (e.g., coursework) for vocational personnel as well as an increased awareness of training programs in the area of vocational/special education. Further, the study revealed that a larger number of educators were enrolling in, and completing programs in vocational/special education. However, the extent of vocational education that was required for special education personnel was not readily known. In summary, the results of the study seemed to imply that although the states were improving their personnel preparation efforts, vocational/special education certification policy and practices appeared generally to be non-systematic and inconsistent among states.

States may approach the problem differently but the presence of handicapped, disadvantaged, limited English-proficient, and other special populations in vocational programs would appear to require a restructuring of certification requirements for vocational/special education personnel. Vocational educators tend to be technically or occupationally oriented and are commonly unaware of the needs of special needs students (Hull, 1979). Therefore, when special needs students are present in their classes, they often do not know how to deal with students' learning problems that arise. Special educators are generally student-oriented but are commonly unaware of career development patterns and processes, vocations, or occupations. Hence, the special

educator finds it difficult to make programmatic suggestions in the vocational component of the IEP; or suggest modifications in vocational curriculum, facilities, and equipment. While a solution to this problem may be to develop and deliver various kinds of preservice and inservice activities, vocational and special education personnel are sometimes resistant to crossing into each other's fields.

Special education courses have become requirements for vocational education personnel in 14 states according to Brock (1979). For example, in 1979, the State of Illinois General Assembly enacted a law requiring that individuals applying after September 1, 1981, for the early childhood, elementary, special, or high school certificate must complete coursework in specific areas concerning exceptional children. The law reads as follows:

"Sec. 21-2a. Required curriculum for all teachers. After September 1, 1981, in addition to all other requirements, the successful completion of coursework which includes instruction on the psychology of the exceptional child, the identification of the exceptional child, including, but not limited to the learning disabled and methods of instruction for the exceptional child, including, but not limited to the learning disabled shall be a prerequisite to a person receiving any of the following certificates; early childhood, elementary, special and high school."

Specifically, the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board has recommended to the Illinois State Board of Education that the following rule be adopted in order to implement this law:

"Coursework, equivalent to three (3) semester hours, on the psychology of exceptional children, identification of exceptional children, and methods of teaching exceptional children. Learning disabilities must be explicitly included in this coursework."

These courses also frequently include information in areas such as learner characteristics, teaching methods, and behavior modification.

Similarly, special educators are sometimes present in vocational courses and/or may have occupational work experiences that help he or she in relating to the vocational program. These courses and experiences provide vocational and special educators with a fundamental knowledge and understanding of learning styles, teaching strategies, and vocational curriculum and assist them in cooperating while working with the special needs student in the regular vocational program. When coursework is not recommended or required for vocational and special education personnel, an alternative strategy has been the infusion of special needs topics in existing coursework to provide an opportunity for practicing or future teachers to acquire similar competencies for working with special needs learners. Such training could impact on the twenty-five percent of high school students who do not graduate with the standard high school diploma. This proportion of dropouts has been static for a decade and now seems to be rising in some states (Evans, 1982). Training would enable teachers to better meet a wide range of individual students' needs. Vocational education personnel need sufficient knowledge and skill to enable them to work with special needs students who will be enrolled in their courses (Holmes & Omvig, 1975).

In summary, neither does the current legislation provide useful guidelines nor is there sufficient research and literature pertaining to issues and practices in the area of vocational/special education certification. The minimal literature which does exist suggests that little is known about this area. Information with respect to vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states such as current certification options, coursework and occupational work

experience requirements, and legislative issues and policies could assist state leadership personnel in developing, implementing, and evaluating effective state certification policies and procedures in the area of vocational/special education certification. As special needs learners are increasingly placed in regular vocational programs, the problem of adequately preparing vocational and special education personnel and establishing certification criteria and policies will become more important within states.

Statement of the Problem

The central problem investigated in this study was to determine existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and trust territories (Puerto Rico, Samoa, Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands). The specific research problem was to identify current vocational/special education certification policies and practices in areas that include: certification options and alternatives, coursework and occupational work experience requirements, and legislative issues and policies.

It was not the intent of this study to evaluate the effectiveness of existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states. In addition, the study did not address how various groups in the states assess needs, plan for, and develop certification policies. This study specifically attempted to obtain baseline data with respect to current policies and practices in the area of vocational/special education in the states. The expectation was that this information would be helpful to state leadership personnel (state directors of vocational education, state directors of special education, state special needs consultants, state Comprehensive System of Personnel

Development (CSPD) officers, state certification board officers, teacher educators, state legislators, and policy makers at the state and local level) in developing effective vocational/special education policies and practices.

Objectives and Research Questions

The following objectives and research questions were developed to resolve the central problem of this study:

- I. Determine the extent to which the states are issuing certification for vocational education and special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education.
 - A. Do the states issue one or more certificates for vocational education personnel, and what are the requirements for certification in the area of vocational/special education?
 - B. Do the states issue one or more certificates for special education personnel, and what are the requirements for certification in the area of vocational/special education?
- II. Assess the extent to which undergraduate and graduate courses are used to meet the requirements of extended certifications (i.e., additional certification, for example, personnel who possess 7-12 vocational education certification and who wish to obtain 7-12 special education certification).
 - C. Do undergraduate courses meet the requirements for extended certification(s), and may undergraduate and graduate courses be used in combination to meet the requirements for extended certification(s)?
- III. Determine the current special education certification options in the states.
 - D. What are the levels (e.g., K-6, 7-12) in which the states grant special education certification?
 - E. What are the separate areas (e.g., mental retardation, learning disabilities) of special education certification in the states?
- IV. Identify the states' vocational education certification policies in terms of work experience and course requirements.

- F. Do the states waive work experience requirements for vocational education certification when a specified number of courses is completed, or when licensure is temporary or provisional?
- G. Do the states presently require vocational educators to complete one or more special education courses before receiving certification, and are these additional course requirements necessary for vocational education certification?
- V. Identify current legislative issues and policies affecting vocational/special education certification in the states.
 - H. Do the states have existing temporary certification policies that are presently under legislative or state department review, and how are current policies perceived by state leadership personnel?
 - I. To what extent is competency-based teacher certification having an impact on certification requirements in the states?
- VI. Determine the extent to which the states are issuing or developing vocational/special education certification.
 - J. Do the states have a vocational/special education certification, and what agencies are presently developing or have established recommendations and/or procedures for certification?
 - K. Are the states interested in participating in a workshop to develop standards for vocational/special education certification?
 - L. Do the states have resources that could assist others in developing policies and practices in vocational/special education certification?

Significance of the Study

The preparation and certification of personnel continues to be an important problem facing vocational education and special education. The development of effective personnel training programs and activities, and vocational/special education certification policies and practices will greatly determine the extent to which special needs learners are

appropriately served in vocational education. However, the data presently suggest that although personnel preparation activities are expanding and improving, certification policies and practices appear to be incomplete and generally not serving the purpose of assuring that personnel are adequately prepared to work with special needs youth and adults in vocational settings.

This study contributes to the body of knowledge in personnel preparation and certification by providing baseline data and information which identify current vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states. Analysis of the existing certification policies and practices provides an indication of the various certification options, coursework and occupational work experience requirements, and legislative issues and policies affecting certification.

The data and information should be helpful to policy and decision-makers including: state education agency personnel, state legislators, and university and college personnel. The information could be useful for evaluating current individual state policies; and developing, implementing, and evaluating future policies. In addition, university and college personnel could use the data and information for planning programs, developing curricula, and working more cooperatively in personnel preparation/certification activities with SEA personnel. Further, the study could provide data for future state legislation, and allocating state appropriations.

Research Procedures

Several research procedures were used to achieve the major objectives and answer the research questions of this study. The procedures included: development of a survey instrument, selection of a population, collection of data, and analysis of the data. The research procedures occurred over a four-month period between November, 1981 and February, 1982.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was developed to collect the necessary data in this study. The items in the instrument were generated from the research questions. The instrument development process used several sources to construct and validate the items in the instrument which included technical assistance requests regarding certification policies and practices from persons in the field, document analyses (e.g., available state certification policies), reviews of literature, and a panel of reviewers. A first draft of the instrument was constructed and sent to ten (10) reviewers who were selected based on their experiences in the area of certification. Using the suggestions and recommendations of the reviewers, the appropriate revisions were made. A second draft of the instrument was then sent to the reviewers for a final critique. After making a few minor changes in the second draft based on the reviewers' comments, the final version of the survey instrument was produced (see Appendix A). The final instrument provided the respondents with twelve (12) items and directions for completing the survey. Generally, the items had a similar format and produced nominal data (yes

or no responses). In addition, several items requested open-ended responses.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the state vocational special needs consultants from the 50 states, District of Columbia, and trust territories (Puerto Rico, Samoa, Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands). The entire population was chosen to participate. The state special needs consultants in some cases may have relatively limited knowledge concerning all areas of certification. However, after considerable inquiry to determine the most appropriate respondents to the survey, the state consultants were selected because they have considerable knowledge in the content area of vocational/special education, particularly in training and personnel preparation. In addition, in a recent survey by the researchers, the state consultants expressed that certification was one of their job sub-functions, especially in the area of providing "technical assistance to certification agencies."

Data Collection

The state vocational special needs consultants' names and addresses were taken from the current national consultants' directory. The surveys and cover letters (see Appendix B) were mailed during the last week of November, 1981, and were to be returned by the fourth week of December, 1981. The state consultants were also requested to include any certification information that their states possessed or had produced. The initial response rate was 40 percent. A follow-up letter (see Appendix C) and another survey was mailed to each

non-respondent during mid-January, 1982 and was to be returned during the first week of February, 1982. The follow-up increased the response rate to 75 percent. During the second week of February, 1982, a telephone follow-up was conducted requesting each non-respondent to return his survey. The data collection process was concluded during the fourth week of February, 1982. The final response rate was 85 percent. The data collection process occurred over a three-month period.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from each of the surveys were collectively analyzed across the states and territories. Descriptive data tables were developed for several of the research questions. The tables report variables, frequencies, and percentages. Generally, the tables and discussion of the findings provide specific data regarding certification options and alternatives, coursework and occupational work experience requirements, and legislative issues and policies relative to vocational/ special education certification.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states, District of Columbia, and surrounding territories. The entire population of 55 states and territories were surveyed. The data that were collected focused specifically on the major objectives and research questions developed in this study. Therefore, the following discussion of the findings is concerned with the major objectives and research questions of this study.

Objective 1: Determine the extent to which the states are issuing certification for vocational education and special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education.

- A. Do the states issue one or more certificates for vocational education personnel, and what are the requirements for certification in the area of vocational/special education?

Fourteen (14) of the 47 state special needs consultants who responded indicated that their states issued one or more certificates for vocational education personnel in the area of vocational/special education. Seventy percent of the responding states do not have a vocational/special education certificate provision for vocational educators. Table 1 presents the requirements for obtaining a vocational/special education certificate in those states reporting such a provision. Also presented are the numbers of states which indicated a particular requirement and the percent response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 14 states and territories that offer vocational/special education certificates and indicated any one of the requirements listed on the table.

Table 1

Requirements for Obtaining Vocational/Special Education Certification
by Vocational Education Personnel in the States

Requirement	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Coursework in special education	11	79%
Coursework in vocational special needs	10	71%
Periodic inservice coursework	9	64%
Work experience	9	64%
Cross-training between vocational education and special education	6	43%
Workshop attendance	6	43%

N = 47 (Total number of responding state consultants)

n = 14 (Total number of states that issue one or more certificates)

Eleven (11) or about 79 percent of the 14 states with such a credential reported that coursework in special education was a requirement for vocational/special education certification. Typical courses may include the psychology of exceptional children and instructional methods and materials. Vocational special needs coursework (combination of vocational education and special education content) was also required by several states (71%). Work experience and inservice coursework were reported as requirements by nearly two-thirds of the states with this credential. Cross-training between vocational education and special education (vocational educators and special educators are in the same courses) and workshop attendance were each listed by less than 50 percent of the states.

In summary, only 18 of the 47 states and territories reporting data indicated that they issued one or more certificates for vocational education personnel in the area of vocational/special education. The most frequent requirement for certification was coursework in special education. In general, coursework and work experience are the two primary requirements in those states offering certification in vocational/special education.

- B. Do the states issue one or more certificates for special education personnel, and what are the requirements for certification in the area of vocational/special education?

Eight (8) of the 47 responding states indicated they issued one or more certificates for special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education. Eighty-three percent of the states did not have a vocational/special education certificate for special educators. Table 2 illustrates the requirements for obtaining a vocational/special education certificate in those states reporting such a provision.

Seventy-five percent of the states which offer certification cited that cross-training between vocational education and special education and/or coursework in vocational special needs were required for vocational/special education certification for special education personnel. Coursework in special education, which may or may not include vocational concepts and content, was listed by almost two-thirds of those states offering the certification option, while occupational work experience was reported by only 50 percent of the states, and inservice coursework and workshop attendance was less frequently required of personnel.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Requirements for Obtaining Vocational/Special Education Certification
by Special Education Personnel in the States

Requirement	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Cross-training between vocational education and special education	6	75%
Coursework in vocational special needs	6	75%
Coursework in special education	5	63%
Work experience	4	50%
Periodic inservice coursework	3	38%
Workshop attendance	2	25%

N = 47 (Total number of responding state consultants)

n = 8 (Total number of states that issue one or more certificates)

In summary, only 8 of the 47 states and territories reporting data indicated that they issued one or more certificates for special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education. The most frequent requirement for certification was cross-training between vocational education and special education. As was the case with vocational personnel, coursework and work experience are the two primary requirements in those states offering certification to special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education. However, while the requirements of vocational education and special education personnel are generally similar, to some extent the requirements for each group are used in varying degrees.

Objective II: Assess the extent to which undergraduate and graduate courses are used to meet the requirements of extended certifications (i.e., additional certification, for example, personnel who possess 7-12 vocational education certification and who wish to obtain 7-12 special education certification).

- C. Do undergraduate courses meet the requirements for extended certification(s), and may undergraduate and graduate courses be used in combination to meet the requirements of extended certification(s)?

In many states, vocational and special education personnel may apply undergraduate courses toward extended certifications (or extensions of certification). For example, 62 percent of the responding state consultants reported that their states permit undergraduate coursework to be used to satisfy the requirements, at least in part, for extended certification. In addition, 73 percent of the states reported that undergraduate and graduate courses may also be used in combination to meet the requirements for extended certification. That is, for personnel who have not or cannot meet all requirements for extended certification, they may satisfy the remaining requirements with graduate courses which may include on-campus instruction, inservice training, workshops, or seminars. In summary, the requirements for extended certification are generally linked to both undergraduate and graduate training programs in several states.

Objective III: Determine the current special education certification options in the states.

- D. What are the levels (e.g., K-6, 7-12) in which the states grant special education certification?

The levels in which the states grant special education certification are presented in Table 3. Also presented is the number of states which indicated a particular level of certification, and the percent

Table 3
Levels of Special Education Certification in the States

Level	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Elementary (K-6 only)	25	53%
Secondary (7-12 only)	24	51%
K-12	37	79%
Post-secondary or adult (only)	1	2%
K-adult	2	4%

N = 47

response which specifies the proportion or percentage of the 47 states and territories that indicated any one of the levels listed on the table.

Each of the 47 states reported some type of level of special education certification. Thirty-seven states indicated that they provide K-12 certification to special education personnel. Fifty-three percent of the states offer elementary only and 51 percent offer secondary only levels of certification. However, some states noted that they provide all three levels. Only three states have a provision for special education certification at the post-secondary/adult and/or K-adult level. This may be partially explained by the fact that special education has been traditionally elementary level oriented in personnel training activities and programs. Secondary special education has not received significant attention over the past several years. In addition, the federal legislation and state initiatives have been focused on K-12 rather than post-secondary or adult programs. However, the field of

special education will need to deal with the problem of post-secondary/adult certification as handicapped students are further placed in these programs and employment settings. The field of rehabilitation which has focused on post-secondary and adult vocational training could provide some guidance and direction in future certification policy-making.

- E. What are the separate areas of special education certification (e.g., mental retardation, learning disabilities) in the states?

The separate areas of special education certification in the states are illustrated in Table 4. The traditional categories or separate areas of special education certification are still common in the states. Certification in hearing impaired, visually impaired, and emotionally disturbed/behaviorally disordered are granted in approximately 75 percent of the states and territories. Personnel may receive certification in educable and trainable mentally handicapped, orthopedically handicapped, or learning disabled in more than 58 percent of the states. The data do not appear to reflect any significant change in certification policy or practice in terms of the noncategorical training programs that have been developed and implemented in several colleges and universities. This seems to suggest that higher education and state department personnel may not (in some states) be directly relating personnel preparation activities with certification practices. This problem tends to magnify as teachers and other personnel move from one state to another and attempt to obtain certification.

Objective IV: Identify the states' vocational education certification policies in terms of occupational work experience and course requirements.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Separate Areas of Special Education Certification in the States

Area of Certification	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Hearing Impaired	37	79%
Visually Impaired	36	77%
Emotionally Disturbed/ Behaviorally Disordered	34	72%
Educable Mentally Handicapped	32	68%
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	29	62%
Orthopedically Impaired	28	60%
Learning Disabled	27	57%
Occupational Therapy	20	43%
Physical Therapy	19	40%
Vocational Coordinator	7	15%
Special Vocational Coordinator	4	9%
Prevocational Coordinator	3	6%

N = 47

NOTE: Several states listed singularly several different areas (27) of certification (e.g., preschool handicapped, gifted, and consulting teacher) and are not included in the Table.

- F. Do the states waive occupational work experience requirements for vocational education certification when a specified number of courses is completed, or when licensure is temporary or provisional?

Nine percent of the responding state consultants indicated that occupational work experience requirements for vocational education certification may be waived in lieu of coursework. When vocational

certification is temporary or provisional, nearly one-fourth of the states reported the option of waiving the work experience requirement for coursework. The option of waiving work experience in some states may reflect an apparent difficulty for individuals in meeting certification requirements. Teacher shortages are likely to increase the number of waivers that are made. In addition, those states reporting such waivers may have some general vocational programs such as industrial arts, consumer homemaking, or general business, which commonly have not had extensive work experience requirements for certification. Although similar programs may be included in the state plans for vocational education and may be receiving federal funds, personnel may not be required to have specific occupational work experience in some states. Occupational work experience requirements have been and are currently important issues facing both personnel preparation programs and certification policies.

- G. Do the states presently require vocational educators to complete one or more special education courses before receiving certification, and are these additional course requirements necessary for vocational education certification?

Twenty percent of the states reporting data indicated that one or more special education courses are required before receiving vocational certification. Courses may include psychology of exceptional children and instructional methods and materials. Five of the nine states requiring special education courses stated that the course(s) represented additional requirements necessary for vocational certification. Some states who did not specify that they require special education courses may be approaching personnel preparation and certification in

other ways. For example, some states may be using the infusion approach whereby special education is "infused" into existing vocational teacher education courses including methods of instruction, practica, and/or philosophy. This approach is an alternative when curricula are already "overloaded" with requirements.

In summary, 80 percent of the states responding stated that special education courses are not required for vocational education certification. In addition, the extent to which states are using alternative strategies was not clear. It appears that collaboration between vocational education and special education at the SEA level may be minimal.

Objective V: Identify current legislative issues and policies affecting vocational/special education certification in the states.

- H. Do the states have existing temporary certification policies that are presently under legislative or state department review and how are current policies perceived by state leadership personnel?

Only 9 of the 47 consultants indicated that they had any temporary certification policies under legislative or state department review. Four of the states claimed that their temporary certification policies were being discontinued. Table 5 presents the state consultants' viewpoints with respect to their states' existing certification policies. One-half of the states responding to the survey felt that their certification policies were appropriate to their states' present needs. This may suggest that while some concern with respect to certification is present, more pressing needs exist and need attention. For example, the need for interagency cooperation may be present in areas more basic than certification. Further, enough information and data may not be available to

Table 5
Attitudes of the State Special Needs Consultants Toward
Their States' Existing Certification Policies

Attitude	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
Appropriate to state's needs at this time	23	49%
Inconsistent (e.g., some specific certifications may be more easily attained than others)	12	26%
Too liberal (e.g., a temporary certificate is issued without sufficient preparation on the part of the individual to attain certification)	10	21%
Too difficult (e.g., some qualified and capable persons who desire and deserve certification may be unable to meet the requirements)	4	9%

N = 47

assist in personnel planning which may help states identify needs, particularly those that relate to both personnel preparation and certification. Approximately 25 percent of the consultants felt that their certification policies were either inconsistent or too liberal. However, less than 10 percent of the consultants indicated that their policies were too difficult or that the requirements were unreasonable to meet. It should also be noted that some consultants had more than one viewpoint on their states' certification policies.

In summary, few states appear to have any active temporary certification policies under legislative or state department review, and those states which did have some are apparently discontinuing them.

Although previous data suggest that personnel preparation and certification are important problems facing SEA personnel, other problems and issues may be given higher priority at this particular time. It should be noted, however, that only 50 percent of the consultants believed their certification policies were appropriate, and almost 50 percent indicated that their policies were inconsistent or too liberal. The implication seems to be that a problem exists and will intensify in many states when other programming issues are at least partly resolved.

- I. To what extent is competency-based teacher certification having an impact on certification requirements in the states?

Thirty-six percent of the reporting consultants believe that competency-based teacher certification was having an impact on certification requirements in their states. It is not surprising that over one-third of the states reported this impact since concerns such as basic skills, teacher competency testing, teacher tenure, students' standardized achievement scores, and other issues have been and continue to be much discussed. Some state consultants indicated that while no impact was presently being made, they perceived an impact in the near future.

Competency-based certification may provide an effective means for linking personnel preparation and certification activities. For example, specific competencies could be developed or identified in a particular state which are necessary for vocational educators and special educators who work with handicapped learners in a vocational setting. The planning and development could involve a committee of teacher educators, SEA personnel, LEA personnel, and others. Subsequently,

competencies or skills could be acquired through preservice and inservice training which are specific to SEA certification requirements. Finally, competency testing could take place at colleges and universities, LEAs, or SEAs. It should be noted that colleges and universities only provide a means to certification through courses, practica, and other professional experiences, and that the state grants certification. In summary, competency-based teacher certification could be a feasible approach toward coordinating the means and ends of certifying vocational and special education personnel in the states.

Objective VI: Determine the extent to which the states are issuing or developing vocational/special education certification.

- J. Do the states have a vocational/special education certification, and what agencies have established or are presently developing recommendations and/or procedures for certification?

Thirty-four percent of the responding consultants indicated that a vocational/special education certificate was presently being issued in their state in the area of vocational education or special education or in both of these areas. Some of the consultants specified that only a proposal existed at the time. The 28 states which did not have a certificate or proposal indicated some of the agencies that had established or were developing recommendations and/or procedures for vocational/special education certification. The agencies are presented in Table 6.

While some states indicated more than one agency, 28 states reported that they have no certificate or proposal and that no agency has developed recommendations or initiated action for developing policies or guidelines. However, 60 percent of the states that did not have a certificate or proposal stated that colleges or universities and/or state

Table 6

Agencies in the States That Have Developed Recommendations and/or
Procedures for Vocational/Special Education Certification

Agency	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
College or University	8	50%
State Department of Vocational Education	8	50%
State Certification Board	2	13%
Professional Standards Commission	2	13%

N = 47
n = 16

departments of vocational education have suggested strategies for developing vocational/special education certification. Many of the consultants were unwilling or unable to explain why their states did not have such a certificate or proposal.

- K. Are the states interested in participating in a workshop to develop standards for vocational/special education certification?

Table 7 presents SEA personnel interests or preferences in attending a conference or workshop designed to develop policy, guidelines, and standards for vocational/special education certification.

While some state consultants indicated more than one conference type, the distribution of interests was relatively similar. The greatest interest or preference appears to be in a state level conference as indicated by nearly two-thirds of the consultants. Regional or national conferences were of interest to at least one-half of the states.

Table 7

Interests of the State Consultants in Attending a Conference on
Developing Policy, Guidelines, and Standards for
Vocational/Special Education Certification

Conference Type	Number of States Identified	Percent Response
State level	31	66%
Regional level	26	55%
National level	24	51%

N = 47

In summary, the majority of states appear to be interested in a conference that will assist them in developing effective vocational/special education certification policies and practices. While state level conferences were most frequently selected, it may also be the most desirable for encouraging and promoting interagency cooperation of SEA personnel. This idea needs further investigation.

- L. Do the states have resources that could assist others in developing policies and practices in vocational/special education certification?

Only 23 percent or 11 states reported that they had materials that could assist others in planning and developing vocational/special education certification policies and practices. This appears to confirm the notion that minimal data and information are available to state planning personnel with respect to developing certification policies. The implication is that more information regarding both personnel preparation and certification needs to be developed and become available to state

leadership and planning personnel. Such information may include: exemplary personnel preparation programs, needs assessment and evaluation information, certification models, and interagency models for linking personnel preparation with certification.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the 50 states, District of Columbia, and trust territories (Puerto Rico, Samoa, Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands). In order to examine the central problem more closely, certification policies and practices in the following areas were investigated: certification options and alternatives, coursework, and occupational work experience requirements. A twelve-item survey instrument was developed to achieve the major objectives and answer the research questions of this study. The entire population of 55 state special needs consultants was chosen to participate. After the initial mail survey and subsequent mail and telephone follow-up surveys, the final response rate was 85 percent. The data analysis process included the development of descriptive data tables and a discussion of the findings.

It was not the intent of this study to evaluate the effectiveness of existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states. Further, the study was not concerned with how various groups in the states assess needs, plan, and input into the development of certification policies. The findings are based on the major objectives and research questions developed for this study. The general findings of this study were:

1. Fourteen of the 47 responding states, District of Columbia, and surrounding territories issued one or more certificates for vocational education personnel in the area of vocational/

special education. In those states which do not have such a certificate, some state departments of vocational education and/or colleges and universities have begun to develop recommendations or procedures for vocational/special education certification. The most frequent requirements in those states which offer such certification were coursework in special education and occupational work experience.

2. Eight of the 47 states and territories issued one or more certificates for special education personnel in vocational/special education. The most frequent requirements in those states which offer such certification were cross-training between vocational education and special education and course work in vocational special needs. In general, coursework and occupational work experience were the two major requirements.
3. Approximately two-thirds of the states permitted undergraduate coursework to satisfy the requirements, at least in part, for extended certification; and 74 percent of the states allowed undergraduate and graduate coursework to be used in combination to fulfill the requirements for extended certification.
4. Thirty-seven states provided K-12 special education certification and about one-half of the states offered K-6 only and/or 7-12 only certification. Post-secondary or adult special education certification was virtually non-existent.

5. Greater than three-fourths of the states reporting issued special education certification in the area of hearing impaired or visually impaired; and about one-half of the states offered categorical certification in areas such as educable and mentally handicapped and learning disabled.
6. Four states (9%) reported that occupational work experience requirements may be waived in lieu of coursework for vocational certification; but eleven states (25%) reported the waiver option only when certification was temporary or provisional.
7. Nine states (20%) required vocational educators to complete one or more special education courses before receiving vocational certification and the courses generally represent additional requirements.
8. Only 9 states reported any certification policies under legislative or state department review, and 4 states cited that their temporary certification policies were being discontinued. Forty-nine percent of the state consultants believed that their certification policies and practices were appropriate to the states' needs. Forty-seven percent claimed that their policies were inconsistent and/or too liberal. Four states (9%) reported having certification requirements that were too difficult.
9. Over one-third of the reporting states claimed that competency-based teacher certification was having an impact

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on certification policies and practices, and several other states perceived an impact in the near future.

10. Thirty-eight percent of the consultants indicated that their states offered a vocational/special education certificate, and in some states which do not have such a certificate, the state department of vocational education and/or colleges or universities had developed recommendations or procedures.
11. Most state leadership personnel expressed an interest in participating in a state, regional, or national level conference designed to assist them in developing effective vocational/special education policies and practices.
12. Sixty-eight percent of the states reporting indicated that they had limited or no useful materials that could assist them in planning and developing effective vocational/special education certification policies and practices.

Conclusions

The conclusions are based on the findings of this study. They are concerned with determining the existing vocational/special education certification policies and practices in the states and surrounding territories.

1. Most states do not issue vocational/special education certification for vocational education and special education personnel; however, coursework and occupational work experience are the primary requirements in those states offering certification.

2. Undergraduate and/or graduate coursework are commonly used to satisfy requirements for extended certification.
3. Most states offer K-12 special education certification; however, post-secondary or adult special education certification is almost non-existent.
4. Categorical special education certification is predominant in most states, while certification in hearing impaired and visually impaired is most frequent.
5. Very few states waive the occupational work experience requirement for vocational education certification, even when certification is temporary or provisional.
6. A limited number of states require vocational educators to complete one or more special education courses before receiving vocational certification and the course(s) generally represent additional requirements.
7. Only a few states have any certification policies under legislative or state department review; however, about one-half of the state special needs consultants believe that their states' policies are inconsistent and/or too liberal and need development and/or revision.
8. Competency-based teacher certification is having an impact on the certification policies and practices in several states, while many state special needs consultants believe that it will impact their states' in the near future.

9. There is a need for state, regional, and/or national level conferences that could assist state leadership and planning personnel in developing, implementing, and evaluating vocational/special education policies and practices.
10. Useful materials are needed by state leadership and planning personnel to aid them in developing vocational/special education policies and practices.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study suggested that most states do not have comprehensive vocational/special education certification in terms of either policies or practices. Some states may offer certification in vocational education or special education, require special education courses for vocational certification, or infuse vocational and special education content into existing courses. However, there appears to be a lack of interagency cooperation among agencies in this area. Personnel preparation and certification activities should be more closely coordinated to develop effective certification policies and practices. The need for vocational/special education certification in the states will probably become more important as increasing numbers of handicapped students are mainstreamed into regular vocational programs.

Several general and specific recommendations can be made based on the findings and conclusions of this study. The recommendations which follow are addressed to vocational and special education state leadership and planning personnel including: state directors of vocational education, state directors of special education, state special needs

consultants, state certification board officers, state comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD) officers, state legislators, and teacher educators.

1. The states need to examine their existing certification policies regarding both vocational and special education. Interagency cooperation between these agencies needs to occur for developing vocational/special education certification policies, procedures, and practices. For example, vocational and special education should review their present certification requirements and determine how they can be coordinated for persons who will work with handicapped students in vocational programs.
2. State education agency personnel need to more closely collaborate with higher education personnel since it is critical that personnel preparation and certification be interfaced when developing certification policy. State departments grant certification, but universities and colleges provide the means to obtaining certification. Therefore, state directors of vocational education, state directors of special education, state special needs consultants, CSPD officers, state certification board officers, and teacher educators must all be involved in policy formulation.
3. Future vocational/special education policy development should begin or continue to focus more attention at the post-secondary or adult level. This population will continue to

increase, and educators will be required to possess expanded competencies to serve them.

4. Vocational education commonly focuses on "special needs" students' needs or functional learning abilities and problems, rather than their categorical (e.g., mental retardation, learning disabilities) handicaps. Therefore, policy-makers may want to investigate noncategorical vocational/special education certification options.
5. The states which presently have a vocational/special education certification option or have a secondary (7-12) certification in vocational education or special education should review and evaluate their existing requirements. Requirements such as occupational work experience and coursework could be reviewed to assess their appropriateness and/or sufficiency.
6. Policy-makers should examine the current trends and issues related to personnel preparation and training which may also apply to certification policy development. For example, competency-based teacher education may provide a way of coordinating SEA and college and university personnel activities. These personnel could jointly work on statewide needs assessments; develop personnel training plans and programs; and collaborate on developing, implementing, and evaluating vocational/special education certification policy and practices.

7. A federal initiative which standardizes vocational education and special education certification language, terms, and definitions would be helpful for enhancing communication among policy-makers in the states.
8. National, regional, and/or state level conferences are desired and needed by SEA personnel. The Office of Adult and Vocational Education and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services should strongly consider sponsoring a joint national conference that could assist state leadership personnel in developing, implementing, and evaluating effective vocational/special education certification policy. At such a conference, state leadership personnel including state directors, state special needs consultants, CSPD officers, state certification board officers, and teacher educators could work together in producing an "action plan" by identifying problems and issues, writing goals and objectives, prescribing activities, and planning product development. The major outcome of the conference should be for each participating state to develop a workable plan for establishing vocational/special education certification. Other options may include conducting conferences at the regional or state levels. These more "local" types of conferences may provide states a better opportunity for getting the necessary people together and involved. All these options need further investigation to ensure the best mode of service delivery.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. State leadership and planning personnel need useful information and materials for assisting them in developing vocational/special education certification policy. Colleges and universities, research coordinating units, national research centers, and other agencies should consider initiating research and development activities in this area. For example, vocational/special education certification models, policy papers, guidelines and best practices documents, problems and issues studies, and other activities and products are needed by state planning personnel. Dissemination of similar materials to appropriate state leadership personnel is also of major importance.
10. Additional studies need to be conducted which should more closely examine and describe the specific certification requirements and policies of those states which have vocational/special education certification.

In summary, the development of vocational/special education certification policies which are coordinated with personnel preparation planning and activities is essential for adequately serving handicapped students in vocational and employment settings. For effective policy to be developed and implemented, vocational education and special education personnel at the SEA and higher education levels will need to collaborate. Several activities were discussed in which these personnel could work together. Handicapped learners will be more adequately served in vocational education if states improve, expand, or begin to develop effective vocational/special education certification policies and

practices which are closely linked to personnel preparation and training.

3009 2007 1017 1011 1011

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

- Brock, R. J. Preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students. Menomonie, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1979.
- Clark, G. M., & Evans, R. N. Preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students: A state of the art in 1977. In Albright, L. and Clark, G. M., Preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students. A teacher education resource guide. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1977.
- Evans, R. N. The role of the federal government in vocational education. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982.
- Federal Register, Position statement on comprehensive vocational education for handicapped persons, Volume 43, Number 186, September 25, 1978.
- Greenan, J. P., & Phelps, L. A. Policy-related problems for delivering vocational education to handicapped learners as perceived by state education agency personnel. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1980.
- Greenan, J. P., Cobb, R. B., & Batchelor, L. J. Vocational/special education personnel development: An analysis of fiscal year 1980 annual state plans. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1981.
- Holmes, M. B., & Omvig, C. P. Supplement 'A': Vocational education for the handicapped in Kentucky: A survey of the perceptions of personnel in vocational education, special education and vocational rehabilitation. Final report. Kentucky State Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education, 1975.
- Howard, R. Vocational education of handicapped youth: State of the art. Washington, D. C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1979.
- Hull, M. E. Vocational education for the handicapped. The Journal of Vocational Special Needs Education, October, 1978, 1 (1), 6-8.
- Phelps, L. A., & Thorton, L. J. Vocational education and handicapped learners: Perceptions and inservice needs of state leadership personnel. Urbana, Illinois: Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, 1979.
- Rude, C. R. State inservice training plans: What is and what could be. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.
- Schofer, R. C., & Duncan, J. R. Statewide cooperative manpower planning in special education: A second status study. University of Missouri, Columbia, 1978.

Appendices

DO NOT FILE THIS PAGE

APPENDIX A

Vocational/Special Education Certification Study

DIRECTIONS: Please complete the survey by placing a check mark [✓] in the appropriate space. Feel free to make any comments which you believe may contribute to this study in the spaces provided. For the purposes of this study, the terms vocational/special education and vocational special needs education are used synonymously.

1. a) Does your state issue one or more certificates for vocational education personnel in the area of vocational/special education?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) If yes, as a part of vocational/special education certification for vocational education personnel, does your state require:

	YES	NO
• Work experience verification	_____	_____
• Coursework in special education	_____	_____
• Cross-training between vocational education and special education	_____	_____
• Vocational special needs coursework	_____	_____
• Periodic inservice coursework	_____	_____
• Workshop attendance	_____	_____
• Other (please specify): _____		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. a) Does your state issue one or more certificates for special education personnel in the area of vocational/special education?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) If yes, as a part of vocational/special education certification for special education personnel, does your state require:

	YES	NO
• Work experience verification	_____	_____
• Coursework in special education	_____	_____
• Cross-training between vocational education and special education	_____	_____
• Vocational special needs coursework	_____	_____
• Periodic inservice coursework	_____	_____
• Workshop attendance	_____	_____
• Other (please specify): _____		

3. a) Do undergraduate courses meet the requirements for extended certifications (i.e., additional certification, for example, personnel who possess 7-12 vocational education certification and who wish to obtain 7-12 special education certification)?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) May graduate and undergraduate courses be used in combination to meet the requirements for extended certifications?

YES _____ NO _____

4. At what levels does your state grant special education certification:

	YES	NO
• Elementary (K-6 only)	_____	_____
• Secondary (7-12 only)	_____	_____
• K-12	_____	_____
• Post-secondary or adult (only)	_____	_____
• K-Adult	_____	_____

5. Please indicate which of the following are separate areas of special education certification at any level in your state:

	YES	NO
• Learning Disabilities	_____	_____
• Emotionally Disturbed or Behaviorally Disordered	_____	_____
• Hearing Impaired	_____	_____
• Visually Impaired	_____	_____
• Educable Mentally Handicapped	_____	_____
• Trainable Mentally Handicapped	_____	_____
• Orthopedically Impaired	_____	_____
• Occupational Therapy	_____	_____
• Physical Therapy	_____	_____
• Prevocational Coordinator	_____	_____
• Vocational Adjustment Coordinator	_____	_____
• Vocational Coordinator	_____	_____
• Special Vocational Coordinator	_____	_____
• Vocational Evaluator	_____	_____
• Other (please specify): _____		

6. a) Does your state waive the work experience requirement for vocational education certification licensure when a specified number of courses is completed?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) Does your state waive the work experience requirement for vocational education licensure when licensure is temporary or provisional?

YES _____ NO _____

7. a) Does your state presently require vocational educators to complete one or more special education courses before receiving certification?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) If yes, do special education course(s) represent additional requirements necessary for vocational education certification?

YES _____ NO _____

8. a) Does your state have any existing temporary certification policies that are presently under legislative or state department review?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) If yes, please describe: _____

c) Do you believe that existing certification policies are:

YES NO

- appropriate to your state's needs at this time _____
- too liberal; for example, a temporary certificate is issued without sufficient preparation on the part of the individual attaining the certification _____
- too difficult; for example, some qualified and capable persons who desire and deserve certification may be unable to meet the requirements _____
- inconsistent; for example, some specific certifications may be more easily attained than others _____

9. a) Is competency-based teacher certification having an impact on certification requirements in your state?

YES _____ NO _____

b) If yes, please comment upon this impact: _____

10. a) Does your state have a vocational/special education certification?

YES _____ NO _____

- b) If no, are any of the following agencies in your state presently developing (or have established) recommendations and/or procedures for vocational/special education certification:

	YES	NO
• Colleges or Universities	_____	_____
• State Department Certification Board	_____	_____
• State Department of Vocational-Technical Education	_____	_____
• Local Education Agency	_____	_____
• Professional Standards Commission	_____	_____
• Other (please specify): _____		

- c) If your state does not have a vocational/special education certification, please indicate why.

11. Would you be willing to attend or send a representative from your agency to participate in a workshop to develop standards for a vocational/special education certification at any of the following levels?

	YES	NO
a) state level	_____	_____
b) regional level	_____	_____
c) national level	_____	_____

12. Do you have any useful information and materials that may help explain the issues, policies, and practices involved in vocational/special education certification?

YES _____ NO _____

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

College of Education
Department of Vocational
and Technical Education
CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

345 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

APPENDIX B

November 31, 1981

Dear State Special Needs Consultant:

Over the past few years, increased emphasis in the states has been focused on developing policies and standards for personnel preparation and certification of vocational/special education teachers and other support personnel. Several states have begun to deal with this task. The Leadership Training Institute (LTI) staff has received several technical assistance requests from the states for baseline knowledge and information for developing certification policies and practices. However, few studies have been conducted and minimal information is available to assist states in establishing effective certification policies and practices for certifying vocational/special education personnel.

The LTI staff is currently conducting a policy study that is intended to assess the present status of vocational/special certification policies in the states. The expectation is that the information from the study will assist state leadership personnel to develop effective policies for certifying vocational/special education personnel. The LTI staff would appreciate, therefore, if you would please take a few moments to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. We need to receive your completed survey by December 31, 1981.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (217) 333-2325. Your cooperation and assistance in this effort is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

James P. Greenan, Ph.D.
Research and Development
Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

JPG:sfb
Enclosures
cc: Charlotte Conaway

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

College of Education
Department of Vocational
and Technical Education
CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

345 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-2325

APPENDIX C

January 15, 1982

Dear State Special Needs Consultant:

Six weeks ago you received a request from us to complete a vocational/special education certification survey. We have enclosed an additional copy of the survey. It would be appreciated if you would complete the survey and return it to us by February 5, 1982. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact me at (217) 333-2325. Your cooperation and assistance in this effort is greatly appreciated! Thank you.

Sincerely,

James P. Greenan, Ph.D.
Research and Development
Coordinator
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

JPG:jm
Enclosures